National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Strategic Change in Organizational Design of National Sport Organizations

©

BY

Lisa Margaret Kikulis

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT STUDIES

Edmonton, Alberta
SPRING 1992

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-73022-6

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:	Lisa Margaret Kikulis
TITLE OF THESIS:	Strategic Change in Organizational Design of National Sport Organizations
DEGREE:	Doctor of Philosophy
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED:	Spring 1992

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

#305, 405-5th Avenue North
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7N 6Z3

Date: December 11, 1991

If you do not understand my silence,
you will not understand my words.

Anonymous.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled STRATEGIC CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN OF NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATIONS submitted by LISA MARGARET KIKULIS in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Trevor Slack
(Supervisor)

Professor C.R. Hinings

Dr. M.A. Hall

Dr. Dave Whitson

Dr. Royston Greenwood

Dr. Ali Dastmalchian

Date: December 11, 1991

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my very first teachers, my Mum and Dad.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand the nature or strategic change in the organizational design of national sport organizations. To achieve this purpose, the study was divided in three interdependent, yet related parts. In the first part, a thorough review of all relevant documents and literature on the structure of amateur sport organizations in Canada provided the information to uncover the coherent arrangements of organizational values and structural design most representative of national sport organizations. Three design archetypes: the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office were identified and provided a heuristic device to guide the empirical analysis of organizational design and patterns of change exhibited by a set of national sport organizations.

The second part of the study involved an analysis of the organizational design change in 36 national sport organizations involved in the Quadrennial Planning Program between 1984 and 1988. For each of the three design archetypes constant empirical referents of structural design were established along three dimensions of organizational structure: specialization, standardization, and decision making. Based on the measurement of 12 elements of organizational structure, profiles of the design archetypes were established as the basis for assessing the variety in organizational design and the patterns of change across three distinct time periods (1984, 1986, 1988). Results showed that national sport organizations moved in two directions, toward the Boardroom or the Executive Office archetype. Results also showed that national sport organizations followed five different patterns of change (inertia, convergence, reorientation, reversal, unresolved) and that change in decision making was restricted to those organizations following a reorientation in the direction of an Executive Office archetype.

Based on the argument that major change toward the Executive Office requires a reorientation of control from volunteers to professional staff, the third part of this study investigated the change in decision making structures for this set of 36 national sport organizations. A fine grained analysis of decision making found that the decision making dimensions of, formalization, locus of decision making, levels involved in decision making, and the concentration of decision making, were more important than the

topic for decision when trying to understand the decision making structures of design archetypes for national sport organizations. It was found that the Executive Office archetype was characterized by a concentration of decision making that is professionally led and volunteer assisted. In the analysis of change it was found that decision making structures have changed across all topics and that substantial change in bureaucratic structuring (specialization and standardization) was accompanied by changes in decision making (formalization, locus of decision making, involvement in decisions). A closer look at major change, however, showed that the concentration of decision making from volunteers to professionals did not occur over the 4 year change period.

The implications of these findings is that by providing anchor points for the analysis of change, the three design archetypes aided our understanding of the variety of organizational designs and patterns of change that national sport organizations may exhibit over a specific change period. The decision making structure was identified as the critical system that describes archetypical change toward the Executive Office archetype. However, change in decision making was most resistant to change. In particular, for these organizations the concentration of decision making with volunteers was the decision making element most resistant to change. Overall, these results indicate that change toward both existing and new organizational designs requires identification of those attributes or organizational structure that signal whole scale change and mark the difference between organizational designs.

Acknowledgements

The source of encouragement to pursue and complete my Ph.D. was from a collective contribution of a number of people. First and foremost, I express my sincere gratitude and respect to my advisor, Dr. Trevor Slack, who first conceived of this longitudinal research project on organizational design change in national sport organizations as a worthy area of study. His dedication and commitment to quality and excellence provided me with the inspiration to accomplish the tasks required in my Ph.D. program. Trevor, thank you for never questioning my ability to get the job done, even when I did myself—your encouragement, concern, and instructive comments throughout my program never faltered, for that I am grateful.

Special thanks must be expressed to the members of my committee. I gratefully acknowledge Professor Bob Hinings for providing me with the much needed and appreciated work space and resources. His generosity did not stop there, he frequently cleared the air when I was in one of my "confused" states. I can only hope that one day I will be able to facilitate learning in a similar manner, thank you Bob. To Dr. Ann Hall for her professional support and interest in ensuring a positive experience in the pursuit of my graduate studies. To Dr. Dave Whitson for his role in providing an insightful and stimulating perspective to our understanding of the amateur sport delivery system in Canada. To Dr. Royston Greenwood who, together with Bob, conducted research and developed the theory from which the essence of this thesis is drawn, your insights undoubtedly contributed to the analysis and strengthened the finished product. And finally, to my external examiner, Dr. Ali Dastmalchian, for his constructive comments and suggestions.

To the Faculty of Business at the University of Alberta, I extend my appreciation for providing the funds necessary for my external examiner to attend my final defense. I acknowledge the expert advice of Terry Terrum at the University of Alberta's Computer Centre. I owe a large debt of gratitude to Dr. Olafson who provided the incentive to pursue my Ph.D. and whose interest and encouragement have continued to support my personal and professional development. Many thanks are extended to my new colleagues at the University of Saskatchewan's College of Physical Education. In the few months I have been there they have provided the supportive environment

required not only to finish this task, but to tackle the many new challenges that await.

A heartfelt thank you is owed to those with whom I shared a variety of experiences. In particular, Aaron, Anne, Brenda, Carmen, Lucie, Teresa, and Tina have each, in their own way, made the past four years a time to remember! Of special note, is Lucie Thibault, to whom I express my deepest appreciation. She not only enthusiastically took on the painstaking task of editing this thesis and supplying me with many excellent critiques, comments, and suggestions; but as a friend, she has always given generously of her time to listen, hear, advise, and encourage—thank you Lucie! My gratitude does not stop here. In general, my graduate studies program in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies at the University of Alberta was enriched by the people I met and the friends I made—I thank you all! I also give my everlasting thanks to my friends back "east" for graciously tolerating my "hermit-like" existence for the past four years.

These acknowledgements would not be complete without recognizing the love, care, and guidance of my family. They shared my happiness and my disappointments; and continued to provide selfless support throughout my graduate work and indeed, ever since I can remember. To my brother Robert, who has always provided the motivation and stimulation necessary for me to pursue and achieve my goals. Finally, to my Mum and Dad, who have always been a constant source of encouragement and inspiration. It is to them that I dedicate this thesis, for it is they who instilled in me the value of education, knowledge, and inquiry. I hope you know how thankful I am for all you have taught me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I Introduction....1
Bibliography....19

II Institutionally Specific Design Archetypes: A Framework for Understanding Change in National Sport Organizations....24
Bibliography....55

III Patterns of Organizational Design Change in National Sport Organizations....60
Bibliography....98

IV High Impact Systems of Change: An Analysis of Decision Making Structures in National Sport Organizations....102
Bibliography....144

V General Discussion and Conclusion....149
Bibliography....163

Appendix 1
Frequency Distribution of Design Archetyp Attributes and Patterns of Change for National Sport Organizations, 1984-1988....165

LIST OF TABLES

Table II-1	Fundamental Differences Between Institutionally Specific Design Archetypes for National Sport Organizations	38
Table III-1	Profiles of Structural Design Attributes for Design Archetypes	74
Table III-2	Reliability Coefficients for Structural Design Scales	75
Table III-3	Means, Standard Deviations, and Coefficients of Variation of Structural Design Attributes for National Sport Organizations Displaying Full Archetypical Occurrence, 1984-1988	78
Table III-4	Frequency Distribution of Organizational Designs, 1984-1988	80
Table III-5	Distribution of Organizational Designs for National Sport Organizations According to Patterns of Change, 1984-1988	82
Table III-6	Average Change in Standard Scores of Structural Design Dimensions by Time Period	83
Table III-7	Change in Standard Scores of Structural Design Attributes According to Direction and Pattern of Change, 1984-1986	84
Table III-8	Change in Standard Scores for Design Attributes According to Direction and Pattern of Change, 1986-1988	85
Table III-9	Linearity of Change for the Reorientation Pattern	88
Table III-10	Change in the High Impact System of Decision Making for Reorientations	91
Table IV-1	Mean Scores of Decision Making Variables by Decision Topic For National Sport Organizations Displaying Full Archetypical Coherence, 1984-1988	124
Table IV-2	Percentage of Decision Making Concentration by Design Archetype	125
Table IV-3	Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for National Sport Organizations Moving Towards the Boardroom Design Archetype, 1984-1988	128
Table IV-4	Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for National Sport Organizations Moving Towards the Executive Office Design Archetype, 1984-1988	129
Table IV-5	Percentage of Decision Making Concentration for Patterns of Change	132
Table IV-6	Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for Reorientations Towards the Executive Office Design Archetype, 1984-1988	134
Table IV-7	Percentage of Decision Making Concentration for Executive Office Reorientations	135

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The development and growth of the administrative structure and management systems of national sport organizations (NSOs) has been a central topic in much of the research that has examined the changing nature of Canada's amateur sport delivery system. Within this literature there has been a tendency to emphasize system-wide structural change in NSOs as a response to government policy initiatives and financial contributions (cf. Harvey & Proulx, 1988; Kidd, 1981; Macintosh, 1988; Macintosh, Bedecki, & Franks, 1987). Implicitly, it is suggested that NSOs, facing external pressures from government agencies to adopt new policies, programs, and structures, have responded by changing in a similar manner. As Macintosh (1988) states,

> recent federal government intervention in the promotion of high performance sport has had a dramatic impact on voluntary national sport organizations. As a result of this intervention, which began some fifteen years ago, associations have enjoyed expanded technical and administrative capacities and enlarged financial resources, provided mainly by the federal government. As well, they have adopted a rationalized approach to program goals and outcomes (p. 121).

While Macintosh is correct in suggesting such transformations have occurred in NSOs, his statement presents an overly deterministic and unitary view of the change process. That is, in attempting to develop an understanding of change that deals with all NSOs, his argument does not consider variation among and between organizations. In addition, other research studies that have examined change in amateur sport organizations in Canada, have supported this unitary view of change by suggesting an evolutionary movement toward a more professional and bureaucratic form (cf. Frisby, 1986; Slack, 1985).

Although it is true that NSOs have changed to become increasingly bureaucratic and professional in their structure, in part as a result of external pressures, such a deterministic view of these organizations is limited. As Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmermann (1989) have stated, "the structure of amateur sport organizations is too complex to be explained simply as a linear progression toward a more bureaucratized and professionalized organizational form" (p. 130). An important element for understanding change that is neglected in much of this research, involves identifying how, or in what particular ways, the relationship between the institutional

environment and the organization is mediated as a result of the values and interests of organizational members (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988).

The concern is that if we continue to develop an understanding of organizational change that sees all NSOs reacting to external pressures in a similar way, we distort and oversimplify the change process. By overestimating organizational similarities and stressing external forces as the sole explanation of change, we ignore two crucial and distinctive issues: the role of strategic choice and the variation in organizational design. It is necessary, therefore, to consider organizations as individual entities that may have varying relations with their environment. It is also necessary to consider the capacity of individuals and groups to influence outcomes, because as Child (1972) suggests, research that examines the relationship between organizations and their environment and ignores internal organizational processes, "fails to give due attention to the agency of choice by whoever may have the power to direct the organization" (p. 2).

The issue of strategic choice is intimately linked to whose values are incorporated into organizational structures and who receives resources to implement their choices. This is decided upon by the dominant coalition or decision makers that have the authority and/or power to make decisions and take action (Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980). For example, organizations do not simply respond to their environments, rather structures are understood by identifying the values, beliefs, and interests that guide the choices of decision makers (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988).

Individuals and groups, then, have certain values which are tied to specific interests. As Walsh, Hinings, Greenwood, and Ranson, (1981) state,

> values held by particular groups and individuals are not free floating, idealistic positions. They are connected to material interests. What is valued depends to a considerable extent on interpretation of the consistency of a group's interests with the likely organizational implications of a particular set of values (p. 138).

In a similar manner, in their analysis of organizational change, Dunphy and Stace (1988) state, "the élites' self interests and/or circumscribed interpretive scheme [i.e., values] may well be preventing the central paradigm shift needed to transform the organization and bring it into fit in a changed environment" (p. 324). In essence, values shape the choices of human agents and consequently, the manner in which they respond to pressures for change. Specific interest groups, therefore, may provide resistance or commitment

toward the desired form of an organization. As Schreyögg (1980) states, "focusing on 'strategic choice' permits decision makers to be treated as the critical link between the resources, opportunities, constraints; and values of the ... organization, on the one hand, and its organizational structure on the other" (p. 317). In essence, organizational values are not isolated from the environmental context, rather they help shape how the environment is interpreted by the powerful organizational members and this is linked to their ability to increase or sustain their interests (cf. Child, 1972; Walsh et al., 1981).

Following the argument that organizational élites influence the manner in which organizations respond to contextual pressures for change and subsequently the organizational design they adopt, there is the potential for a variety of organizational designs to coexist within the same environment. Acknowledging the role of choice, however, does not presume that decision makers are completely autonomous in their choice of design (Schreyögg, 1980). Specifically, the variety of viable organizational designs is a result of both the influence of organizational members on the environment and the tolerance of the environment for alternative forms. As Mintzberg (1991) states, "there may not be any one best way [to organize], but there are certainly preferred ways in particular contexts" (p. 58). Changes in NSOs, therefore, should not simply be explained as system-wide trends toward increased professionalization and bureaucratization. Rather, the variety in organizational design needs to be understood. This can be applied by identifying common design configurations that exist within a population of organizations. This type of information will then enable us to identify the nature of the change process that is occurring in these organizations.

The work of Miller and Friesen (1984), which has demonstrated that sample-wide predictions do not hold true for individual design configurations, is consistent with an approach that examines individual organizations. Design configurations are "different constellations of conceptually distinct variables or elements that commonly cluster together to characterize many aspects of organizational states and processes" (Miller & Friesen, 1984, p. 4). Miller and Friesen suggest that there is a strong argument for the identification of individual design configurations in order to accurately study the manner in which organizations change.

In the context of amateur sport organizations, the utility of identifying organizational designs has been acknowledged by the work of Hinings and Slack (1987) and Kikulis et al. (1989). By examining the way in which amateur sport organizations have differentiated and integrated their tasks, these researchers identified a small number of common design configurations that can be used to describe and compare amateur sport organizations. While the empirical establishment of design types of amateur sport organizations is useful to demonstrate that there is variation in the extent to which NSOs exhibit professional and bureaucratic characteristics, such an approach to understanding change in these organizations is cross sectional and hence static. As such, it does not explain the dynamic nature of change in these organizations.

Where studies have undertaken longitudinal investigations of the structuring of amateur sport organizations (cf. Cunningham, 1986; Cunningham, Slack, & Hinings, 1987; Zimmermann, 1988), they have not emphasized the importance of core values in enabling or constraining change in structure, strategy, and systems. Rather, they have assumed that change was a rational response to achieve organizational goals. Thus, they support the argument for a natural evolution of amateur sport organizations toward more bureaucratic and professional forms. More specifically, for these researchers, the focus on changes in organizational structure, has failed to explain how organizations change in different ways over time.

Greenwood and Hinings (1988) suggest, the implication for organizational design and patterns of change is that all structural and systemic elements are not valued equally, that is, "some structural elements are more crucial than others in an organization because they embody central values" (p. 300). Hinings and Greenwood (1988) suggest that if organizations are to make successful reorientations then the decoupling of values from structural arrangements is necessary and that those systems at the core of the organization's values must lead the change. A comprehensive understanding of organizational change, therefore, requires identification of those structural elements that have a "high impact" on organizational design coherence and are thus, most resistant to change (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). The underlying argument of this research study is that for NSOs, this resistance occurs in the decision making structure. More specifically, it is the volunteer governed decision making structure

which is deeply entrenched in the values of these organizations that has a high impact on organizational design change. Since high impact systems embody the core values of the organization and it is a fundamental change in these elements that enables whole scale change (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988), then change in decision making structures may be highly significant for understanding the movement of organizations between design configurations. Although researchers have included decision making as a central topic in the study of configurations, few researchers have emphasized decision making as a means for understanding how organizations are structured and subsequently the way they change.

The underlying thesis to be examined is that the viability of structural designs for a set of organizations and the patterns of change that are chosen, are strongly influenced by the core values of organizational members. This focus will lead to an understanding of how decisions and choices about structural arrangements, in organizations that have a history of volunteer governance, are influenced by these values.

Historical Context

The purpose of this section is to describe the historical and institutional setting of NSOs that has, over the years, placed increasing pressures on these organizations to develop high performance sport programs and to adopt a more professional and bureaucratic organizational form. A brief review of the historical context of NSOs seems appropriate here because as recent literature has shown, in order to understand the change process within an organizational sector, a knowledge of its history is helpful (cf. Child & Smith, 1987; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987; Pettigrew, 1987). Thus, the strategic change in NSOs between 1984 and 1988 has been shaped by the decisions, choices, and forces of the past.

Historically, NSOs in Canada were small and independent entities which organized national championships and enforced rules governing participative and competitive programs. Under the direction of volunteer executive members, this period of autonomous and fundamentally unstructured sport delivery, which for most NSOs began in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, continued largely uninterrupted until the 1970's. It was around this time that Canada's NSOs were involved in a significant reorientation and entered a new period of evolutionary growth toward a

more professional and bureaucratic form (Broom & Baka, 1979; Kidd, 1988; Schrodt, 1983).

In 1969, The Report of the task force on sports for Canadians reported on the sorry state of the administrative and technical programs for sport in Canada and called for a reorganization of NSOs to improve the delivery system. The Task Force Report's recommendations came to be seen as appropriate and necessary if Canada was to develop athletes that could compete at a world class level. As Macintosh (1988) states, "on the basis of many of the Task Force's recommendations, the federal government embarked on a course of direct aggressive promotion of the development of elite athletes" (p. 124). Munro's (1970) government policy for amateur sport, A proposed sports policy for Canadians also had a significant role in setting the strategic direction of amateur sport delivery and formalizing direct federal government involvement through funding.

As the financial support that the federal government allocated to NSOs grew during the 1970's, these organizations had to meet certain program conditions imposed by the granting agency (cf. Broom & Baka, 1979; Kidd, 1988; Macintosh et al., 1987). In particular, government reports throughout the late 1970's and early 1980's stressed the importance of NSOs orienting their operations so that they would be part of a comprehensive high performance sport delivery system (cf. Campagnolo, 1977, 1979; Regan, 1981). For example, in the 1979 white paper, Partners in pursuit of excellence: A national policy on amateur sport, Campagnolo, the first Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, claimed that the Ministry " ... is concerned primarily with the development of a national sports policy to meet the challenge of international competition, through the production of sports programs for athletes by the sports governing bodies" (p. 6). In a reaffirmation of the federal government's role in high performance sport, the 1981 white paper, A challenge to the nation: Fitness and amateur sport in the 80s, reports:

> In the 1980's Fitness and Amateur Sport will continue to focus its energies and resources on the pursuit of excellence in amateur sport. This commitment means that the government's support will be largely channelled in the direction of international competitions—such as the Olympic, Commonwealth and Pan American Games—as well as bilateral competitions (p. 10).

In this period, the changes that occurred in Canadian sport, in an effort to develop a comprehensive sport delivery system, built momentum. That is,

the growth in government involvement and the emphasis on high performance sport had a substantial impact on both the environment of NSOs and NSOs themselves.

The recommendations in the Task Force Report (1969) to improve the quality of the Canadian sport delivery system and the subsequent growth of government involvement led to an increased environmental complexity for NSOs. Environmental complexity is defined by Robbins (1990) as the degree of heterogeneity and concentration of environmental elements. A complex environment can thus be described as one in which there is a number of different types of components for an organization to consider. During the 1970's NSOs established ties with a growing network of government funded initiatives and agencies that were created to assist these organizations in improving their administrative and technical effectiveness.

For example, Sport Canada was created in 1971 to initiate and support specific programs to help Canadian athletes in their pursuit of excellence. It established block funding to NSOs for specific projects, meetings, championships, and travel. One of the basic methods by which Sport Canada assisted NSOs to develop and manage their programs was by contributing toward the salaries of full-time employees, such as Executive Directors and Technical Directors. Sport Canada also established channels to monitor program implementation by funding and staffing consultant services that provided programming advice to NSOs (Broom & Baka, 1979; Macintosh et al., 1987)

To facilitate the management of this expansion, in the early 1970's, the first geographically centralized office location for NSOs, the National Sport and Recreation Centre (NSRC), located near Ottawa, was created to provide office space and administrative services for NSOs. The national offices of NSOs were moved to this central location and paid staff were hired to manage their daily operations. The continued growth of NSOs necessitated the relocation to a new building, and in 1989, NSOs moved to the Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre (CSFAC) (Athlete Information Bureau, 1988). The consequence of centralized national offices has been that information flows more readily through these central offices and the professional staff play a larger role in monitoring and disseminating information to their constituents (e.g., membership, volunteers, agencies). As a result of this federal initiative to formalize the administrative functions

of NSOs, these organizations underwent substantial internal restructuring and have expanded their programs along the lines suggested by the government.

Together with the relocation of responsibility for sport within the government (i.e., Sport Canada) and within NSOs themselves (e.g., NSRC/CSFAC, administrative staff), was the development of a variety of support agencies and programs in the environment of NSOs. In particular, technical support for high performance sport was enhanced through, the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC), established to promote coaching as a profession and coaching certification programs; the Canada Games, established to provide high level competitive opportunities for athletes that have not yet achieved international calibre; and the Athlete Assistance Program, (direct federal funding to athletes), established to cover the costs of training, travel, and education expenses. Technical support systems such as training centres, camps, and tours, also initiated by the federal government, have had a major role in organizing and stabilizing the technical services for amateur sport in Canada and specifically for our NSOs (cf. Broom & Baka, 1979; Kidd, 1988; Macintosh et al., 1987).

The impact of the environment on the organization is, of course, a result of the organization's dependence on the particular components with which it deals. Organizations create internal roles or units to manage those ties in the environment which are perceived to be critical to their success. In response to complex environments, then, organizations increase their differentiation of roles and tasks. As the diversity of roles and activities in an organization increase there are further demands to manage and coordinate this differentiation. Consequently, formal policies and documentation are incorporated by organizations to integrate the differentiation which was a result of environmental complexity (cf. Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

These external agencies that have increased the complexity of the environment for NSOs, developed new programs that gained status as important organizational goals (e.g., comprehensive high performance sport programs) and were adopted by these organizations. NSOs depend on, and obtain resources by developing ties with these agencies. These ties have resulted in increased programs and services in NSOs such as, athlete performance (for funding and team selection), coaching certification, high performance sport training centres, and a bureaucratic administrative

structure. By sanctioning specific administrative practices and technical programs, the various agencies (e.g., NSRC/CSFAC, Sport Canada, CAC) have played a major role in the structural changes within NSOs.

The administrative and technical growth at the national level triggered a similar response at the provincial and club level (cf. Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1991). Many of the coaching and training programs developed and supported by NSOs were thus filtered down to provincial and local sport organizations. The widespread introduction of these programs and agencies further compounded the number of external components that influenced the operations of NSOs. Unable to ignore the complexity of their environment, NSOs have adapted to the interests of the most powerful of these external agencies (their primary funding agency), Sport Canada, (Kidd, 1988).

As many authors have noted, the increased government involvement in amateur sport and the resultant increased environmental complexity triggered a movement toward a more bureaucratized and professionalized form of NSOs. Frisby (1985, 1986), Slack and Thibault (1988), Whitson and Macintosh (1988), and others have all analyzed the differentiation of these organizations into various specialities and professional roles and the coordination of this growth by the introduction of bureaucratic systems and processes. As NSOs increasingly adopted programs and criteria established by external agencies, their legitimacy and their ability to mobilize resources came to depend on maintaining congruence between their purpose and structure and the institutional understanding of what NSOs should do. It became a widely accepted belief, within the Canadian sport delivery system, that adopting management systems and processes coherent with a professional bureaucratic form of organizing would make the product and the functioning of NSOs more effective and efficient.

It is important to recognize that although NSOs faced the same pressures from their institutional environment, these organizations have unique histories and may be distinguished on this basis. Change in these organizations represents not only the external pressures in the environment on key people in NSOs, but the interpretation of these programs by these individuals. Although the pressures external to organizations may initiate a need for change in organizational design, the process of change in organizations reflects the values, power, and interests of organizational members (cf. Child, 1972; Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980;

Walsh et al., 1981). While all NSOs have experienced similar forces from their external environment, primarily government agencies, the impact of these forces on organizational design, varies according to the historical context of these organizations and the strategic choices made by individuals who govern and manage these organizations (cf. Child, 1972; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987). Consequently, it is essential to recognize this variety in structural design when analyzing change in a set of organizations.

The Research Setting

While the changes in the institutional environment, the increased environmental complexity, and the adoption of a more professional and bureaucratic form have, both individually and collectively, resulted in substantial structural changes in NSOs, there have been few attempts to distinguish the patterns and sequence of this change. A central premise of this research, which extends the work of Hinings and Slack (1987), Kikulis et al. (1989), Slack and Hinings (1987), Slack and Thibault (1988), Thibault (1987), and Thibault, Hinings, and Slack (1991) is that our understanding of the changing nature of Canada's amateur sport organizations is limited. During the 1970's and early 1980's changes in NSOs were incremental. That is, in response to government initiatives NSOs made adaptations in their programs in an effort to enhance the effectiveness of the delivery of amateur sport services. Although these changes supported an evolutionary movement of NSOs from simply structured and voluntary governed organizations toward a professional and bureaucratic form (cf. Kidd, 1988; Macintosh, 1988; Macintosh et al., 1987; Regan, 1981; Task Force Report, 1988), they did not alter the fundamental character of NSOs. These changes were made around the traditional values for volunteer governance that underpin the structures and systems of these organizations.

With the introduction of the Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP) in 1984, however, NSOs were given special impetus for frame-breaking change (cf. Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). Initiated by Sport Canada, a directorate of the Ministry of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport of the Government of Canada, the QPP was tied to the strategic purpose of increasing the performance of elite athletes at international competitions and fielding a "Best Ever" team for the 1988 Olympic Games. Prior to 1984, the government supported these organizations by providing relatively

unconditional grants for their programs and services. Essentially, the role of Sport Canada was to react to proposals for support submitted by NSOs. This approach made it difficult for Sport Canada to establish strategic planning within these organizations. It was an aim of Sport Canada to use the QPP as an administrative tool to focus the strategic direction of NSOs and, as they saw it, increase their efficiency and accountability.

Based on the assumption that a proactive stance was necessary for developing high performance sport, each NSO was required to develop a quadrennial plan to systematize their high performance sport objectives and programs. Sport Canada evaluated these plans and based on these evaluations allotted funds to NSOs to assist plan implementation. The responsibility of the government was no longer to react to the requests of NSOs for funding. Rather the substantial funding allotments tied to the QPP gave the government leverage to influence the strategic orientation of NSOs' administrative structure and management systems.

The change period, delineated by the introduction of the QPP in 1984 and its end point marked by the Olympic Games in 1988, "reflected a significant growth in all sport from a business, managerial, and organizational perspective" (Task Force Report, 1988, p. 27). During this four year period NSOs were involved in a change that required a whole scale shift in structure, strategy, and process. In particular, the large scale hiring of administrative and technical staff and the structural design changes required addressing the responsibility of these staff to manage these changes (cf. Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988).

If the reaction of NSOs to demands for change during the QPP is based on changing roles and responsibilities of organizational members, an increase in professional staff would be accompanied by the decentralization of decision making to professional staff together with reduced involvement of volunteers. The argument in support of such a change states that the complexity of operations in NSOs requires professional control over decision making. Prior to 1984 all decisions were finalized by the volunteer board, with the substantial funding attached to the QPP, the board was to assign financial blocks to specific areas or programs and the paid staff were to be given the autonomy to make specific funding allocation decisions.

Although the commitment and loyalty of volunteers has never been questioned, their expertise and capacity to manage the operations of NSOs has

been raised (cf. Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1990; Pugliese & Taylor, 1977; Task Force Report, 1969, 1988). Initially arguments for paid staff were presented on the grounds that voluntarism alone was insufficient to run NSOs effectively. More recently, the issue of control has emerged as professional staff have gained controlling access over information pertinent to the operations of these organizations. In 1984, the QPP provided pressure for a change in the systems, structure, and strategy of NSOs toward a professionally controlled organization. Changing the decision making structures was not an explicit aim of the QPP, however, as the restructuring of high performance sport programs occurred, it became clear that this change implied a different kind of decision making structure than that traditionally found in NSOs. Specifically, it was felt that professional staff would be more effective in managing these changes required to operate successful high performance sport programs in these organizations (cf. Task Force Report, 1988).

For those NSOs that have accepted the idea of professional authority, there may be a gradual transfer of decision making to professionals in light of the ideas on how to operate these organizations. However, for this change to take hold in the structure and systems of NSOs, that is, a change to a qualitatively different organization, one led by professionals and supported by volunteers (Slack & Hinings, 1987), there must be a substantial shift in the core values of volunteer led decision making in these organizations (cf. Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). One consequence, for those involved in the management and design of these organizations, is that they will not only have to be cognizant of the variety in organizational design for NSOs, but they will also need to understand the role that values play in any explicit attempt to transfer the decision making to professional staff working in these organizations. As Zucker (1983) argues, "organizations are not simply constrained by the institutional environment: they often define their own position in it" (p. 12). That is, organizational members are faced with a choice on how to respond to institutional pressures for change. These choices, of course, are influenced by past decisions, values, and interests that may constrain or enable organizational change.

Research Methods and Objectives

In the search for configurations or coherent organizational designs, the recent emphasis in organizational theory has suggested that an organization's

structure is a result of mutually reinforcing elements rather than independent elements (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Miller & Friesen, 1984; Mintzberg, 1979). Mintzberg (1979) has emphasized the interconnections between structural elements; for Miller and Friesen (1984), strategy, structure, and environment configure to form a whole, and more recently, Greenwood and Hinings (1988) have advanced the concept of coherence to include both structure and values in identifying what they call design archetypes as a mode of understanding organizational change.

For Greenwood and Hinings (1988), "the classification and identification of organizational design archetypes becomes a function of the isolated clusters of ideas, values and beliefs coupled with associated patterns of organizational design" (p. 295). They further clarify that values regarding domain of operations (spheres of activity), principles of organizing (structure and process), and criteria of evaluation (measures of performance effectiveness) shape organizational arrangements and transitions. In effect, a comprehensive understanding of organizations rests on the ability to recognize how organizations interrelate their attributes giving rise to specific configurations referred to as design archetypes.

It is in this respect that recent work in organizational theory can inform researchers in their efforts to describe and analyze NSOs in terms of their similarities and differences not in purely structural terms, rather as efforts to realize wholly different values. Application of these concepts of design coherence and configurations to NSOs may lead to an understanding of the patterns of change in the design of these organizations.

The research for this thesis is presented in three independent yet related studies. Building on the theoretical and empirical findings of past research, the characteristics of organizational design coherence for NSOs are identified in Chapter II. Emphasis was placed on the argument that important relationships among structure and values exist that identify the design archetypes most representative of NSOs. An analysis of organizational design that considers the values which underpin structural elements provides an opportunity to assess how organizations, within the same institutional sector and facing the same institutional pressures for change, display a variety of organizational designs and patterns of change. As a conceptual framework for understanding change, the institutionally specific design archetypes that were uncovered for NSOs are seen to have significant implications for

understanding the degree and direction of change within a set of NSOs over the 1984-1988 time period.

Specifically, Chapter III presents an empirical assessment of the degree and direction of change experienced by a population of NSOs involved in the QPP. As a heuristic device, the design archetypes uncovered in Chapter II were operationalized to determine how close a set of NSOs were representative of these archetypes and how far they were distributed away from them over time. Using the design archetypes as a model for change, a comprehensive understanding of the shifts in structure and value coherence during an important strategic change period was provided. The focus here was on understanding the degree and direction of change based on approximations to the design archetypes uncovered for NSOs.

Chapter IV presents an investigation of the high impact system of decision making in NSOs and its role in the strategic changes in which these organizations were involved. The ability to make or be involved in decision making is a significant factor in understanding patterns of change in NSOs (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). As Hinings and Greenwood (1988) suggest, control over decisions has an important role in constraining or enabling change. Consequently, the implications for the traditional volunteer controlled decision making structure and the strong external pressure to change toward professional control are explored through a comprehensive analysis of the change in decision making over the 1984-1988 period.

The arguments presented in Chapters II, III, and IV lead to several distinct, yet interrelated conclusions. The outcome of these separate but related analyses are discussed in the concluding chapter which addresses these issues and implications in an attempt to offer new insights to our understanding of how a set of organizations change the way they do.

It is important here to describe the research design and data collection for the empirical study of organizational design change in NSOs that is presented in Chapters III and IV. A particular emphasis is given to the issues and implications of secondary data analysis.

Research Design

The analysis of change in Chapters III and IV involved a longitudinal study of structural change in 36 national sport organizations (NSOs) in

Canada. Although these organizations were similar in that they were involved in the QPP and thus represented a population of organizations, they were quite diverse in terms of their organizational designs at the initiation of the program. Consequently, the time frame of the QPP (1984-1988) provided an opportunity to examine the changes in organizational design that occurred for as set of NSOs undergoing similar pressures to change.

The research was based on secondary analysis of data collected during the actual change period by a team of researchers at the University of Alberta investigating the impact of planning on change in NSOs between 1984 and 1988. The principle researchers were interested in learning about the impact of planning on the organizational design change of NSOs. Specifically, the purpose was to understand change through real time data analysis. The longitudinal nature was in sharp contrast to the previously cross-sectional surveys of change in NSOs up to this point.

The design, fieldwork, and preliminary analysis were conducted by researchers at the University of Alberta, core funding for the project came from Sport Canada. Preliminary results were reported to the funding agency during 1987 and 1988. Data was collected, banked, and preliminary analysis was conducted at the time this particular study was initiated. The data bank was stored at the University of Alberta and the researcher was provided with unlimited access to all data collected during the tenure of the project. The researcher herself joined the research project in 1987. My role was to contribute to the conceptual development and empirical analysis of the project, to assist in the development of multi-item scale, to code data, to conduct interviews with paid staff and volunteers at the provincial level, and to write preliminary research reports. Thus, I obtained familiarity with the research design, the theoretical framework, the procedures for data collection, and the methods before this particular analysis was initiated.

The population of 36 NSOs was maintained throughout the entire project. Numerous data were compiled resulting in a large pool of data holding longitudinal records, representing a rich source for the analysis of change. Data was collected at specific intervals during the 4 year change period (1984-1988). The temporal framework selected was a series of discrete intervals. Repeated surveys of the organizational characteristics of NSOs were recorded in 1984, 1986, and 1988. The data for this study, collected through face-to-face interviews conducted with professional staff, focused on

assessing the objective characteristics of structure and context in these NSOs. Generally, interviews lasted up to an hour. A structured interview schedule was used to record the presence or absence of specific organizational dimensions. An effort was made to keep the same informant across time, in some cases this was not possible. This was not viewed as a severe limitation as the most "qualified" person was always the informant.

In addition, the analysis in Chapters III and IV is based on "factual" data collected about the structure of NSOs over time. Although there was data on the beliefs, values, attitudes, and opinions of individuals in these organizations, it was felt that any attempt to integrate this information for the purpose of describing the structural design change in NSOs, would be severely limited. Specifically, open ended interviews would be taken out of context given that the data were not reported and stored with the sequencing of questions. Rather reports were constructed by the interviewer about the events and discussion that took place during the interview. Thus, content analysis of specific constructs would be very difficult to verify. Although the sources and methods of interviewing for these subjective data were obtained, a rich interpretation of the data was not possible because of the secondary nature of the analysis which does not consider the context of the interview process. Thus, the analysis here is limited to factual information about organizational structure.

The main advantage in using secondary based data is the opportunity to assess longitudinal change which would have been too costly and time consuming otherwise. As a key historical period in the evolution of Canada's sport delivery system, the time frame of the QPP was not arbitrary, rather it was critical to understanding events that have lead to important issues and consequences of the event. The data made available through the research project at the University of Alberta was the most complete and available data for this entire time period and thus provided the opportunity for a comprehensive analysis of organizational design change. Although these data were secondary in that they were not collected at the time of this particular study, the analysis itself was not secondary as the researcher was involved in the research project's preliminary analysis. In essence, this study was an extension of the original data compiled and gathered by other researchers.

Data Collection

The issue of availability was not a problem for this particular secondary analysis as the researcher had access to all data that was viewed as relevant to the research problem. Nevertheless, the secondary nature of the data was acknowledged to have some limitations, therefore, it was important to assess the validity and reliability of the data (cf. Dale, Arber, & Procter, 1988; Hakim, 1987; Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985). Dale et al. (1988) suggest that secondary analysts should become fully aware of the nature of the data, methods of collection, limitations this imposes on analysis, and subsequent interpretations. For this reason, additional information was sought from the original researchers involved in the research design and data collection. Although there was frequent contact both on an informal and formal basis with the project initiators, more detailed issues were addressed through a questionnaire that was given to the five researchers involved in the initial development and data collection of the project. The questionnaires were delivered personally with a verbal and written explanation. In two cases, the questionnaire was mailed. Questionnaires were returned between September and December 1990. All researchers provided detailed answers pertaining to their role in the project. Questions were developed based on issues of secondary data analysis raised by Dale et al., (1988), and Kiecolt and Nathan (1985). It is the testimonies of the original researchers which provides the sources of the validity of this data.

Constant interaction among the researchers provided a research environment where problems and issues were discussed and solved during scheduled or casual meetings. Therefore, the primary basis of validity and reliability was achieved through the capabilities of the researchers. As stated by one primary researcher:

> The real basis for validity and reliability comes from the knowledge and understanding of the researchers. This was high for two reasons. First, because they were not 'hired hand' researchers in the sense of having to be brought up to speed. They had already been working in the area and their careers were interdependent with the success of the project. Second, they were all involved with the project over a considerable period of time, not coming in and out for a couple of hours here and there (Hinings, 1990).

The primary concern regarding the validity of this secondary analysis occurs with the document analysis where researchers indicated that as more was done, familiarity increased yet analysis was not iterative. That is, earlier

documents were not necessarily re-analyzed once "familiarity" was achieved. This being the case, and given the access to all original documents. These documents were reviewed for the time period 1984 (the data obtained from documents). Each organization's documents were re-analyzed for any inconsistency's in coding. Consequently, the information provided by the original researchers prompted an assessment and adjustment (where necessary) of the data prior to analysis.

Bibliography

Athlete Information Bureau. (1988). House of sport. Champion, 12, 8-9.

Broom, E.F., & Baka, R.S.P. (1979). Canadian governments and sport. Ottawa: Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Sociology of Sport Monograph Series.

Campagnolo, I. (1977). Toward a national policy on amateur sport: A working paper. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Campagnolo, I. (1979). Partners in pursuit of excellence: A national policy on amateur sport. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. Sociology, 6, 1-22.

Child, J., & Smith, C. (1987). The context and process of organizational transformation-Cadbury Limited in its sector. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 565-593.

Cunningham, D. (1986). Paradigmatic change in voluntary sport organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Cunningham, D., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Changing design archetypes in amateur sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 59-81). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Dale, A., Arber, S., & Procter, M. (1988). Doing secondary analysis. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Dunphy, D.D., & Stace, D. (1988). Transformational and coercive strategies for planned organizational change: Beyond the O.D. model. Organization Studies, 9, 317-334.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1990). Issue: High performance management issues, a group discussion. Proceedings of For excellence: a symposium on Canadian high performance sport sport (pp. 50-51). February 12-14, 1989. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Frisby, W. (1985). A conceptual framework for measuring the organizational structure and context of voluntary leisure service organizations. Society and Leisure, 8, 605-613.

Frisby, W. (1986). The organizational structure and effectiveness of voluntary organizations: The case of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 4, 61-74.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization Studies, 9, 293-316.

Hakim, C. (1987). Research design: Strategies and choices in the design of social research. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Harvey, J., & Proulx, R. (1988). Sport and the Canadian state. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 93-119). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Hinings, C.R. (1990). Survey response.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hinings, C.R., & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of quadrennial plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 127-151). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Kidd, B. (1981). The Canadian state and sport: The dilemma of intervention. Annual conference proceedings of the National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education. Brainard: Human Kinetics.

Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class power, and the Canadian state. In P.J. Galasso (Ed.), Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kiecolt, K.J., & Nathan, L.E. (1985). Secondary analysis of survey data, Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, Series no. 07-053. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R., & Zimmermann, A. (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. Journal of Sport Management, 3, 129-150.

Kimberly, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 595-622.

Lawrence, P., & Lorsch, J.W. (1967). Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration. Boston: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Macintosh, D. (1988). The federal government and voluntary sport associations. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 121-140). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Macintosh, D., Bedecki, T., & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). Sport and politics in Canada: Federal government involvement since 1961. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1984). Organization: A quantum view. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1991). The effective organization: Forces and forms. Sloan Management Review, 32, 54-67.

Munro, J. (1970). A proposed sports policy for Canadians. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.

Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M.L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. The Academy of Management Executive, 3, 194-204.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1987). Context and action in the transformation of the firm. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 649-670.

Pugliese, D., & Taylor, B. (1977). Sport and the volunteer at the national level. Ottawa: National Sport and Recreation Centre Inc.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 1-17.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley & G. Salaman (Eds.), The international yearbook of organizational studies (pp. 197-221). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Regan, G. (1981). A challenge to the nation: Fitness and amateur sport in the 80s. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Robbins, S.T. (1990). Organization theory: Structure, design, and applications. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Schreyögg, G. (1980). Contingency and choice in organization theory. Organization Studies, 1, 305-326.

Schrodt, B. (1983). Changes in the governance of amateur sport in Canada. Canadian Journal of History of Sport, 14, 1-20.

Slack, T. (1985). The bureaucratization of a voluntary sport organization. International Review for Sociology of Sport, 20, 145-165.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., & Thibault, L. (1988). Values and beliefs: Their role in the structuring of national sport organizations. Arena Review, 12, 140-155.

Task Force Report. (1969). Report of the task force on sports for Canadians. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.

Task Force Report. (1988). Toward 2000: The report of the task force on national sport policy. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Thibault, L. (1987). The dynamics of plan implementation in national sport organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Thibault, L., Hinings, C.R., & Slack, T. (1991). Values and organizational structure. Working paper. University of Alberta.

Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1991). Professionalism, structures and systems: The impact of professional staff on voluntary sport organizations. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 26, 83-99.

Tushman, M.L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 7 (pp. 171-222). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Walsh, K., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Ranson, S. (1981). Power and advantage in organizations. Organization Studies, 2, 131-152.

Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1988). The professionalization of Canadian amateur sport: Questions of power and purpose. Arena Review, 12, 81-96.

Zimmermann, A.K. (1988). Structural and contextual change in provincial sport organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Zucker, L.G. (1983). Organizations as institutions. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), Research in the sociology of organizations: Vol. 2 (pp. 1-47). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

CHAPTER II

Institutionally Specific Design Archetypes: A Framework for Understanding Change in National Sport Organizations

It is a widely held view that national sport organizations (NSOs) in Canada have become more formally organized and sophisticated requiring both professional expertise and bureaucratic mechanisms for coordination and control. Researchers such as Frisby (1986), Kidd (1988), and Macintosh (1988), have all discussed how internal and external forces for change, such as growth in size, increased scope of activities, and prescribed government policies, have influenced the structural design of these organizations. The primary orientation of these researchers has, however, been to treat NSOs as a single type (i.e., professional and bureaucratic). There has been little consideration in their work of the fact that the processes of professionalization and bureaucratization may affect organizations in different ways. Only Hinings and Slack (1987), Kikulis, Slack, Hinings, and Zimmermann (1989), and Slack and Hinings (1987) have suggested that the processes of professionalization and bureaucratization, which have been influencing amateur sport organizations for a number of years, has not been uniform. Following the lead of studies on organizational design in general, these authors interpret levels of professionalization and bureaucratization in relation to elements of organizational structure. For example, in their respective studies, Hinings and Slack (1987) and Kikulis et al. (1989) found that amateur sport organizations displayed a variety of structural designs. The argument presented here is that the design of organizations, including amateur sport, involves multiple structural dimensions that display various levels of professionalization and bureaucratization.

Researchers in organizational studies have suggested that elements of structure are interrelated and it is the patterning or coherence of these elements which should be considered when trying to understand the variety in organizational design and the nature of change between design types (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b; Miller & Friesen, 1984; Mintzberg, 1979). In addition, a growing body of literature suggests that various structural forms are qualitatively different. That is, particular structural designs are supported by the values of organizational

members. The relationship between structural designs and members' values has been identified as the basis for understanding these qualitative differences (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b; Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980; Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980). It is this synthesis between structure and values that is emphasized in Greenwood and Hinings' (1988) notion of design archetypes. Specifically, they define a design archetype as particular " ... beliefs and values that shape prevailing conceptions of what an organization should be doing, of how it should be doing it and how it should be judged, *combined with* structures and processes that serve to implement and reinforce those ideas" (p. 295).

Along the lines of "ideal types", design archetypes are simplified models that isolate the elements of organizational design and their interrelationships. Derived as a conceptual tool, they are most useful in understanding organizational phenomena. As Miller and Friesen (1984) suggest, the incentive for organizational analysis and specifically the analysis of change, is to look for patterns of reality in organizations around which to develop an understanding of the order that exists within the context of the variety and complexity of organizations. Thus, the identification and examination of design archetypes for NSOs will help us discover useful distinctions before making predictions.

Cunningham, Slack, and Hinings (1987), Macintosh and Whitson (1990), and Slack and Thibault (1988) have all made an initial contribution to our understanding of the kinds of design archetypes and changes occurring in Canadian amateur sport organizations. Macintosh and Whitson identified two potential archetypes, the "traditional" archetype which opposes professional staff autonomy and values a broad domain of activities; and the "corporate volunteer" archetype which supports professional management and governance and a narrow focus on the high performance sport domain. Cunningham et al.'s. work identified a "corporate professional" archetype characterized by values for a high performance sport focus, preference for professional organization, greater standardization and specialization, and an emphasis on objective measures of performance. Similarly, Slack and Thibault found that members of NSOs held values and beliefs that supported a more professional and bureaucratic form. Even though this was not its intended focus, this theoretical and empirical work carried out on structure

and/or change in amateur sport organizations in Canada, provides initial support for the existence of design archetypes in NSOs.

Extending this lead, the central concern in this chapter is the development of a theoretical framework that will assist our understanding of the variety of organizational design types and the nature of change between these design types for a set of NSOs. It is not the view of this chapter that there is an "optimal" organizational design for NSOs, rather it will proceed from an argument that not only considers the variety in design of NSOs but considers the values that give coherence and stability to these structural arrangements. The general aim, therefore, was to ***uncover the limited number of design archetypes that most significantly represent NSOs by describing the patterns of structure-value coherence that are most often identified in this sector of organizations.***

The identification of design archetypes for NSOs provides a conceptual model for understanding the variety in structural design and the patterns of change exhibited by these organizations. That is, the structure of organizations and the values which underpin them have a substantial influence on the manner in which organizations change. NSOs, therefore, may move from one archetype to another though not necessarily in a linear fashion. It is through the notion of design archetypes, then, that changes in the organizational design of NSOs may be understood.

In the first section of this chapter the theoretical approach used to isolate and understand design archetypes is discussed. Issues underlying institutional specificity, institutionally specific design archetypes, and organizational design coherence are identified. This highlights the unique characteristics of NSOs in their sector. The next section of the chapter outlines the methods used to uncover design archetypes for NSOs. The third section introduces three institutionally specific design archetypes that were uncovered through an analysis of previous theoretical and empirical research on NSOs. Each design archetype is presented by examining its dominant values and the structural designs which represent these values. Attention is focused on the coherence and stability of design archetypes for NSOs. In the final section, the importance of these design archetypes for informing our understanding of organizational change and the implications they have for the process of change in today's NSOs is addressed.

Theoretical Approach

Institutional Specificity

The issue of organizational change has been a central research focus in organizational theory for a number of years. Early contingency models of change suggested that an organization's structure is adapted in response to contextual pressures. While it is correct to imply that organizational structure is constantly changed to maintain a fit with the environment and that a variety of relationships between structure and environment exist for all organizations, it is equally important to recognize that "different sectors are seen to carry different organizational design requirements" (Child & Smith, 1987, p. 567). It is this understanding that is emphasized by a number of organizational theorists who have developed an understanding of organizations in their sector (cf. Child, 1988; Child & Smith, 1987; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b; Miller & Friesen, 1984).

Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a,b) work suggests that the number and variety of legitimate organizational designs may vary between sectors of organizations. Consideration of sector differences, therefore, may not identify the best organizational design for a particular context but it may point to the preferred organizational design(s). The assumption is that a sector may constrain or enable organizational change for a specific set of organizations. Thus, the sector perspective raises some key issues which are relevant for the phenomena of organizational change.

An understanding of an "organization-in-its-sector" refers to the structures and interactions among a set of organizations which have a common purpose. This includes both organizational producers (e.g., NSOs) and organizations that supply resources and/or impose constraints (e.g., Coaching Association of Canada, Sport Canada). According to Child and Smith (1987), there are three characteristics of organizational sectors which are important for understanding organizational change: i) "the sector is taken to constitute an *objective reality* possessing identifiable and measurable characteristics which are of consequence for [organizational] strategy and structure" (p. 566). In essence, objective conditions, defined as, the economic, technical, and/or legislative demands of other organizations, may determine the design requirements and appropriate activities for a set of organizations; ii) the sector sets the "*cognitive arena* with which its members identify" (p. 566). Specifically, the objective conditions are perceived and interpreted by

organizational members who have a distinct set of values or ideology regarding what is legitimate. Sectors are defined by a common understanding of the design and goals of an organization. These shared values provide a frame of reference to guide the organizational form that is adopted by organizational members; and iii) sectors provide a *"collaborative network"* of information and resources between constituents in an effort to enhance efficiency and productivity. As Child and Smith (1987) state, "channels of collaboration can become channels for the import of new management practices" (p. 571). Child (1988) argues that the sector concept:

> is a superior analytic construct to environment because it implies greater specificity with respect to the social and economic attributes shared by populations of organizations providing similar goods and services, together with the other organizations which regularly transact with them in a supplying or servicing role (p. 14).

According to Child (1988) and Child and Smith (1987), the degree and nature of interactions between and among organizations set the objective conditions or organizational design requirements for a set of organizations. An important aspect of the objective reality for NSOs is the intensity and level of interaction between government and NSOs that has increased dramatically during the past 25 years. Although the increased role of the federal government has had an impact on the growth of NSOs, it has also influenced the structure of the organizational sector. In this respect, the main impact has been on the increased influence of public interests in what have traditionally been private organizations.

Traditionally, NSOs took the responsibility for the development of their particular sport and the role of the government was one of assistance. "This 'self-help' principle was the mainstay policy of the FAS [Fitness and Amateur Sport] program since its inception to 1969" (Hallett, 1981, p. 763). The recommendations of the Task Force Report (1969) were implemented during the early 1970's and as a consequence, direct government involvement in amateur sport was introduced (cf. Broom & Baka, 1979; Lappage, 1985; Macintosh et al., 1987; Sawula, 1977).

Accompanying this shift, was the promotion, by public funding agencies (i.e., Sport Canada), of high performance sport development (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). In addition, this promotion was supported through the development of agencies representing both public and private interests (e.g., National Sport and Recreation Centre, Coaching Association of Canada,

ParticipAction, Hockey Canada, Sport Medicine Council). "By 1977, the sport system in Canada had undergone further evolutionary change which caused it to differ a great deal from the framework operating some twenty-five years earlier" (Baka, 1978, p. 406). The creation of government supported agencies and increased financial assistance from the government to NSOs shifted some of the responsibility for the development of amateur sport away from NSOs. From a sector perspective, by the 1970's, the institutional setting for NSOs had changed from predominantly private to public interests.

Although the organizational design may be established by objective conditions, the response of sector specific organizations involves an element of choice by organizational decision makers. That is, values and beliefs, both internal and external to organizations, establish a common ideology of what objectives and mode of operations are legitimate (cf. Child, 1972, 1988; Child & Smith, 1987; DiMaggio, 1983). For NSOs, the financial dependence on government influences their organizational design because there is external pressure on the scope of what is legitimate, and thus what organizational design is valued. Reflecting values for accountability, the government has encouraged NSOs to focus on increasing administrative efficiency and providing comprehensive high performance sport programs. It is suggested that mechanisms for change are particularly authoritative given the political and economic ties of NSOs to the federal government. This is a defining characteristic when distinguishing the "cognitive arena" for NSOs.

The federal government's provision of block funding to NSOs for the hiring of paid staff and their support for a network of agencies have influenced the diffusion of both new ideas about structural design and subsequent change in these organizations. DiMaggio (1983) states, that "by providing a collective target and raising the stakes of participation in a common enterprise, public funding agencies encourage organizations to become more conscious of their participation in a field [or sector]" (p. 155). In this vein, the establishment of national offices at the National Sport and Recreation Centre assisted NSOs in developing a cooperative network in which the sharing of resources, interests, and information (i.e., interorganizational relations) have influenced the changes in NSOs themselves (Regan, 1981).

Thus, an understanding of the importance of sector specificity is obtained by considering the set of organizations that: operate under similar objective

conditions; have a common ideology or expectations that must be achieved; and are involved in specific network transactions of information, services, material, and human resources. "The underlying thesis is that there are key aspects of sectors, populations or institutional settings that have to be understood because of the way they bind a set of factors together to produce particular outcomes" (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a, p. 194). By considering these ideas, the concept of sector or institutional specificity may be used to illuminate the unique circumstances of NSOs.

The central point being made here is that investigations of a set of organizations require a consideration of the unique organizational interactions and the context in which they have developed. Moving beyond the contingency arguments for environmental determinism, sector specificity considers organizations as "enactments" of their sector rather than formal structures involved in interdependent relationships with their environment (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). In particular, sector specific characteristics identify the reality that an organization confronts. "That is, organizations are driven to incorporate the practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work and institutionalized in society" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 340). The concept of "sector" supports the notion that organizations operate within an "institutionally specific" area. From a theoretical perspective then, the challenge for organizational scholars is to proceed with what has been termed a sector specific or institutionally specific understanding of organizations and the phenomena which influence them.

What has been argued in this section is that the expectations of how to structure varies across organizational sectors. In particular, by discussing: i) the importance of considering the social interactions in defining sector characteristics and; ii) the suggestion that NSOs exist within a unique institutional setting, support is provided for the argument that an understanding of NSOs in their sector will help identify the variety in organizational design and patterns of change in NSOs. In essence, sector specificity provides explicit, theoretically grounded criteria that establish meaningful limits to the set of organizations to be investigated. ***The theoretical approach of institutional or sector specificity provides a basis for determining more meaningful comparisons of organizational design and a more comprehensive understanding of how a set of organizations may respond to external pressures to change.*** The development of a useful sector

specific approach depends upon the technique used to isolate phenomena. It is this issue that is addressed in the following section.

Institutionally Specific Design Archetypes

Recently, there has been agreement that organizational design must be understood in terms of a "holistic" approach. Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) and Miller and Friesen (1984) argue that organizations display patterns of interdependent elements and that it is the manner in which these elements interact that demonstrates the viable design configurations for a set of organizations. Miller and Friesen's (1984) thesis is that there are "commonly occurring clusters of attributes or relationships ... that are internally cohesive, such that the presence of some attributes suggest the reliable occurrence of others" (p. 12). Similarly, Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) suggest that "organizational structures and management systems are best understood in terms of overall patterns rather than by an analysis of narrowly drawn sets of organizational properties" (p. 7). Essentially, these researchers call for an understanding of organizational design and change that considers the similarities and differences among and between organizations.

The patterning or coherence of organizational design is typically identified through three key structural dimensions: specialization, the differentiation of roles and tasks; standardization, the existence of rules, policies, and procedures; and centralization, the level at which final decision making authority rests. In the study of organizational design in general (cf. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968; Pugh, Hickson, & Hinings, 1969) and amateur sport organizations in particular (cf. Frisby, 1986; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Kikulis et al., 1989; Slack & Hinings, 1987), these dimensions have been empirically and theoretically established as the core dimensions of organizational structure. Thus, it is the interrelationships among these dimensions that are particularly important for identifying the limited number of coherent organizational designs that best describe a set of organizations.

Of primary interest for this study is Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a) argument that,

> patterns of organizational design, i.e., design archetypes are to be identified by isolating the distinctive ideas, values and meanings that are pervasively reflected in and reproduced by clusters of structures and

> systems. An organizational archetype, in this sense, is a particular composition of ideas, beliefs and values connected with structural and system attributes (p. 18).

In effect, the concept of design archetype supports research on organizations that is not restricted to attributes of structure. Along these lines, Miller and Friesen (1984) state "seldom is there an attempt to substantively broaden the research and view relationships within a richer interpretive context, one that incorporates many potentially relevant variables, including perhaps, those of strategic choice and time" (p. 11). For example, how an organization is structured depends upon the beliefs (i.e., what is legitimate) of organizational members and the extent to which these beliefs are valued (i.e., preferred). Therefore, some structural arrangements may be adopted not because they are valued but because they are legitimate. By contrast, resistance to certain prescribed changes may be a function of strong value commitments.

As Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, and Walsh (1980) point out, "the structural arrangements and the values and beliefs which underpin them, appear mutually constituting and re-creating, supporting the assertion that extensive consensus can reinforce the status quo and the resistance to change" (p. 216). Over time these organizations develop what Miller and Friesen (1980, 1984) call "momentum" to carry on the patterns of activity which allows only "incremental" changes and resists whole scale changes.

To fully understand organizational change the suggested research approach is one that focuses on an institutionally specific set of organizations and examines, longitudinally, the structural design change within and between these configurations. Institutional specificity implies the analysis of interrelationships among relatively homogeneous groups of organizations. A central element to this approach is the development of institutionally specific design archetypes, that are identified based on "an interpretive understanding of the meanings which organizational members attach to their actions, of the aims, purposes and intentions which they bring to bear upon situations in order to shape their probable course" (Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980, p. 197). Sector specific design archetypes represent the unique combination of organizational characteristics that collectively describe a set of organizations.

> The number and form of design archetypes within a population of organizations can only be ascertained through close attention to the meanings which organizational actors give to their situation, the connections made between those meanings and organizational

> arrangements and the historical context of ideas and legitimation processes operating upon them (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a, p. 27).

Design archetypes ***guide*** classification by focusing on characteristics of organizations, in this case, structure-value coherence, which makes it possible to analyze and understand organizational phenomena in an institutionally specific set of organizations.

In essence, the literature on institutional specificity identifies a number of organizational features which serve as a theoretical underpinning for the assessment of the structural designs and patterns of change (cf. Child, 1988; Child & Smith, 1987; DiMaggio, 1983; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b). In particular, the work of Hinings and Greenwood provides support for uncovering the limited number of coherent design archetypes for an institutionally specific sector of organizations. The following section outlines the features of design archetype coherence.

Features of Organizational Design Coherence

Organizational Values

Current research in organizational studies has emphasized organizational values as key features of organizational design coherence and change (cf. Laughlin, 1991; Hinings, Brown, & Greenwood, 1991; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b). Hinings and Greenwood (1988b) have identified three value areas which shape the organizational design of an institutionally specific set of organizations: i) domain, which refers to what products, services, and clientele are most appropriate for the organization; ii) principles of organizing, which refers to values regarding the proper roles, rules, and reporting relationships; and iii) criteria of effectiveness, which refers to expectations of how the organization should be judged and evaluated. In addition to these value areas, Kimberly (1987) and Kimberly and Rottman (1987) point out that in the analysis of organizational design and change, sources of legitimation and support are central, yet too often neglected, indicators of what orientation an organization values. These value areas (domain, principles of organizing, criteria of effectiveness, and orientation) have distinct features that shape the structural designs most relevant for NSOs.

Orientation. The sources of legitimation and support for NSOs represent values that according to Kimberly and Rottman (1987), have significant consequences for the orientation of volunteer nonprofit organizations. A

value for "self-help" private interests is a source of legitimacy which NSOs have built into their structure. The requirements of "self-help", that is, a philosophy for volunteer-self governance, has a long history in influencing how NSOs should be structured (cf. Baka, 1978; Greaves, 1976; Hallett, 1981; Sawula, 1977). It is this orientation that has shaped the underlying values about how controls, decisions, and authority are exercised in these organizations. For NSOs, sources of legitimation vary between an emphasis on private interests to reduced private interests in favour of public interests.

Kimberly and Rottman (1987) also contend that a significant indicator of a nonprofit orientation is the source of funding that maintains an organization. They suggest that the importance of financial support may be assessed by identifying its role in shaping the direction of the organization. For NSOs, proportions of funding vary between the following sources: membership fees, fundraising, corporate sponsorship, unconditional government grants, and government funding tied to specific program objectives. It is from these sources of funding that ideas and expectations about the organization's objectives, activities, and structure are created. Thus, it is sources of financial support that influence the degree to which the "self-help" philosophy is maintained and the volunteer nonprofit orientation valued in NSOs.

Domain. The services and market or the appropriate domain for NSOs ranges from one that values programs and activities that develop and promote participation in competitive sport for a range of age and skill levels, to a domain that emphasizes programs and activities which solely support the preparation of elite athletes for international competitions (i.e., high performance sport). It is also necessary to consider aspects of the environment that influence what "domain" the organization values. As Meyer (1979) states, "an organization's products and clientele may change over time, and these changes may occur due to organizational action or shifts in the environment" (p. 128). In other words, the domain for NSOs is influenced by the organization's responsibilities to its key constituents and by the organization's need to acquire valued resources. As such, the role of the government has a considerable influence on whether or not NSOs develop domestic sport programs to improve the fitness and health of all Canadians or show more concern for the development of comprehensive high performance sport programs to assist national and international calibre

athletes in attaining their performance objectives (cf. Baka, 1978; Broom & Baka, 1979; Hallett, 1981; Macintosh et al., 1987).

Principles of Organizing. The formal structures that NSOs adopt are reflections of organizational values associated with reporting relationships, job responsibilities, and rules. For example, with reference to the structures and systems used by NSOs to produce programs and to adapt to changes in their environment, values regarding the proper way to manage their operations vary between those that emphasize minimal coordination, those that support a volunteer hierarchy of authority, and those that promote professionally managed and controlled structures. In essence, the degree of standardization of policies and procedures, the level of specialization of roles, the role of paid staff, and the hierarchy of authority are expressions of organizational values regarding principles of organizing (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988).

Criteria of Effectiveness. Success for NSOs may be assessed according to membership satisfaction, quality of programs, and/or more concretely, in terms of success in different types of competitions. A few authors have attempted to identify the criteria of effectiveness for NSOs. The argument that NSOs have restructured their programs and activities to become more effective in achieving optimal outputs and obtaining necessary resources is demonstrated in the work of Chelladurai, Szyszlo, and Haggerty (1987), Frisby (1986), Neill (1983), and Vail (1986). Generally, these authors maintain that NSOs must attend to their environments, that is, the key constituents and adopt standard systems of operating to ensure effectively coordinated programs.

More recently, NSOs have adopted planning systems which introduce more objective measures of performance success (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Slack & Hinings, 1987). The shift away from a volunteer governed orientation to one in which there is an increased role of public interests (through grants, contracts, and cooperative initiatives) has developed a primacy for accountability and efficiency within NSOs. By tying funding to policy initiatives (e.g., Quadrennial Planning Program), the concern is with the outcome of high performance sport programs (i.e., medal standings) and the efficiency with which these goals are achieved (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Kidd, 1988; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Hinings, 1987). These issues

are important to further our understanding of how organizational values regarding criteria of effectiveness underpin the structural design of NSOs.

It is not just that values regarding orientation, domain, principles of organizing, and criteria of effectiveness are emphasized but, that these values are given meaning in organizational practices. As Walsh, Hinings, Greenwood, and Ranson (1981) state, "actors embody their frameworks of value and belief in the structural arrangements and policy process of the organizations in which they work" (p. 218). It is how these values interact and underpin patterns of structure that influences what the design archetypes are for a specific set of organizations. Greenwood and Hinings (1988) argue, "the notion of coherence between these beliefs and values, on the one hand, and structural arrangements and processes on the other, provides a basis for the delineation of organizational archetypes" (p. 299). Design archetypes, then, are identified through the structural expression of organizational values.

In the previous sections, empirical and theoretical evidence has been presented in support of establishing institutionally specific design archetypes. It was argued that when establishing organizational designs, an understanding of organizations in their sector can be achieved through the theoretical approach of institutional specificity. In the section on institutional specific design archetypes it was argued that it is the coherence between structure and values that establishes the design archetypes for a set of organizations. Finally, features of design coherence were elaborated and the organizational values that underpin organizational design for NSOs were outlined. Nevertheless, the critical factor in establishing the viability of sector specific design archetypes is in the strength of the empirical examples supporting the existence of coherent design archetypes. Supplying such evidence is the primary task of the remainder of this chapter. The following section outlines the research methods that were followed to uncover design archetypes for NSOs.

Methods

In order to identify sector specific design archetypes for NSOs, the method used here followed the approach taken by Greenwood and Hinings (1988) who stated, "to establish an organizational archetype, underlying values have to be first isolated and the structural and processual implications

analyzed *by the observer*" (p. 300). It was not a matter of placing organizations ***a priori*** in categories, rather it was a matter of identifying the categories that were exemplified by the activities and structures of these organizations.

The first step involved becoming familiar with the relevant available data. An analysis of the literature relevant to NSOs was undertaken to assess the organization and administration of their programs and activities and to identify patterns of structure-value coherence. In particular, a theoretical argument for the establishment of institutionally specific design archetypes was supported by drawing on an extensive review of key historical and current documentary sources such as journals, books, official documents, research reports, newspaper and magazine articles, and theses and dissertations written on the Canadian sport delivery system. This analysis provided information on areas such as the growth of sport activities and organizations, the development of bureaucratic sport organizations, the introduction of professionalization, and the extent to which organizational values underpin these elements. These data were then assessed and discussed according to values associated with orientation, domain, principles of organizing, and criteria of effectiveness. The variety in organizational design for NSOs was subsequently defined according to the attributes that were observed by tapping the historical and secondary data sources.

In developing an argument for socially constructed types, McKinney (1966) states,

> the elements and relations actually found in historical and contemporary social life supply the materials out of which the conceptual tool is constituted. These are identified, articulated, and simplified into the constructed type on the basis of some idea of the social scientist's as to the nature of social reality and on the basis of the purposes of [the] inquiry (p. 203).

In general, what is presented is the "ideal" cases or characteristics. The values and corresponding structural arrangements of the design archetypes that were uncovered, are summarized in Table 1. It should be noted that the names and labels used do not reflect judgements about the appropriateness of the administration within these organizations rather they reflect certain commitments to ways of organizing. Consequently, in this analysis each design archetype is considered equally viable for these organizations depending on the values, the dependency, and the pressures that characterize the institutional sector.

Table II-1
Fundamental Differences Between Institutionally Specific Design Archetypes for National Sport Organizations

	Kitchen Table	Boardroom	Executive Office
Organizational Values			
Orientation	Private, volunteer nonprofit (membership & fundraising)	Private, volunteer nonprofit (public & private funds)	Public volunteer nonprofit (government & corporate funds)
Domain	Broad: mass-high performance sport	Competitive sport opportunities	Narrow: high performance sport
Principles of Organizing	Minimal coordination; Decisions making by volunteer executives	Volunteer hierarchy; Professionally assisted	Formal planning; Professionally led and volunteer assisted
Criteria of Effectiveness	Membership preferences; Quality service	Administrative efficiency & effectiveness	International success
Organizational Structure			
Specialization	Roles based on interest & loyalty	Specialized roles & committees	Professional technical & administrative expertise
Standardization	Few rules; Little planning	Formal roles, rules, & programs	Formal roles, rules, & programs
Centralization	Decisions made by a few volunteers	Decisions made by the volunteer board	Decisions decentralized to the professional staff

In the following section, empirical and theoretical evidence, from different studies, documents, and reports on the structuring of NSOs, is presented to demonstrate the typical relations between structure and values in these organizations. More specifically, the following section distinguishes three design archetypes which appear particularly relevant to NSOs. Uncovered from historical and theoretical material, they also have empirical

equivalents in the literature on amateur sport organizations in Canada (cf. Cunningham et al., 1987; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Task Force Report, 1969, 1988). More important for this research, is that design archetypes have tentative explanatory power by considering the variety in organizational design and many of the transformational changes that NSOs have incurred. Having identified the key elements of each of the four organizational values and the three structural dimensions, the remainder of this chapter addresses their coherence in terms of the unique characteristics of these sector specific design archetypes.

The Kitchen Table Design Archetype

Organizational Values

The long standing volunteer nonprofit orientation of NSOs is legitimated by values for volunteer control and a responsibility for providing programs that satisfy membership needs. In addition, valued sources of support favour a principle dependence on private fundraising and membership fees. Thus, the orientation is reflected by organizations that are largely independent from public granting agencies (e.g., government). Essentially, sport is considered the responsibility of the private, volunteer nonprofit sector (Hallett, 1981). The government's role is one of assisting these organizations in helping themselves. As Hallett (1981) stated, for the period before the 1969 Task force report on sports for Canadians:

> the principle that amateur sport should control itself and be responsible for raising the funds it required in the private sector remained a firmly held one by persons in sport and was an underlying policy of all federal government administrations for the period (p. 269).

Specifically, there is a general belief that NSOs should operate their activities autonomously. What Hallett (1981) called the "self-help" principle is the central value for both government and private organizations. In other words, NSOs develop and implement their own programs independently. With limited resources, NSOs are legitimated based on their members' shared private interests in the survival of their organization.

Given this autonomy, NSOs have considerable flexibility in their choice of domain. The broad range of services that these NSOs provide, demonstrate values for organizing sport programs and competitions that are equally balanced between organized mass participation and elite competition. The lack of a specific domain is observed in the objective of providing a

service which satisfies the membership at large. Organizations operate from year to year by focusing their resources on special programs or events as they emerge. For example, prior to the 1970's, both NSOs and the government supported the preparation of elite athletes for national and international competitions by providing funding for travel purposes. In general, however, the focus of activities in NSOs was on the provision of programs and activities which promoted the participation of all skill levels in competitive sport emphasizing fitness and mass sport opportunities. This domain is characteristic of NSOs that have developed along regional interests to govern various contests and coordinate playoffs for national championships (cf. Baka, 1978; Broom & Baka, 1979; Hallett, 1981; Lappage, 1985).

This considerable scope of activity is supported by principles of organizing that are underpinned by values for minimal coordination and executive decisions made by volunteers. Generally, the early years of sport organization in Canada were characterized by local and community participation, simple rules and organization, and rudimentary equipment and facilities. NSOs were small units operating on a limited budget and had the autonomy to direct their own affairs (cf. Baka, 1978; Hallett, 1981; Howell & Howell, 1985; Lappage, 1985; Macintosh, 1985). Nevertheless, even as late as 1984, some newly created NSOs held these values (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987).

As a rule, self-governed organizations decide their own objectives, goals, and methods. As Howell and Howell (1985) explain, sport in Canada has a long history of being " ... directed, organized, and coached by individuals in their spare time, in makeshift facilities and with continual insufficient funding" (p. 413). Consequently, the legitimate mode of operation for NSOs is one in which organizations are operated in the spare time of volunteers around the kitchen tables of their homes (Munro, 1971). The underlying belief with respect to principles of organizing is that a person with interest and/or seniority in the organization has the competence to coach, judge, and/or administer the sport. In effect, personal qualities of the individual tend to override the specific requirements of the role. By overlapping friendship and membership, control is maintained by self-regulation based upon a common interest in the organization and its mission.

For the most part, organizational members judge the success of their own programs and activities. Consequently, values regarding evaluation are oriented toward the organization. For example, prior to the 1969 Task Force

Report, the government was not overly concerned with assessing the effectiveness of NSOs. These organizations did not have to justify their programs to external constituents and thus had little accountability outside of their own organization. Given the major source of income for this design archetype is from self generated membership fees and private fundraising, the benchmark for evaluation is defined by membership preferences for competitions and programs. These broad and diffuse criteria are underpinned by a collective interest in membership satisfaction and organizational survival from year to year. Specifically, behaviour and activities are guided by subjective evaluations such as the quality of programs and services (cf. Howell & Howell, 1985; Lappage, 1985; Schrodt, 1983).

Organizational Structure

Together these values are given meaning in organizational practices that correspond to what has been labelled "kitchen table" administration (Task Force Report, 1969), a design archetype primarily exemplified in this sector of organizations before the 1970's but still found, even in recent years, in some smaller or newly created NSOs (Hinings & Slack, 1987). The flexible domain of activities found in such organizations is reflected in a structure of volunteer executives dispersed across the country. From the standpoint of structural design, it follows that the Kitchen Table design archetype places little emphasis on establishing formal rules and specialized roles to guide behaviour. Rather, concern is placed on organizing programs and competitions that meet membership needs. Consequently, volunteers with loyalty, desire, and commitment to the organization undertake a variety of tasks rather than having specialized roles.

In Slack's (1985) analysis of the bureaucratization of a voluntary sport organization, he identified a loose and informal organizational structure where roles were not specialized, rules and regulations were not formalized, records were not kept, there was little planning and coordination of activities, decision making and communication was informal, and the main role of organizations was to sanction championships. Slack (1985) also found that decision making tended to be centralized in the hands of a small number of executives and led by "charismatic" presidents who usually held their position for a number of years. Other findings indicated that in such organizations, programs are run by individuals who have general rather than

specialized roles (cf. Baka, 1978; Hallett, 1981; Schrodt, 1983). As stated in the Task Force Report (1969), "typically, the president of an association is also its administrative staff, accountant, legal counsel, public relations officer, and stenographer ... " (p. 58). Thus, for the Kitchen Table, membership values for generalist roles and responsibilities are manifest in an organizational design where a handful of volunteers oversee the policies, programs, and finances of the organization.

This institutionally specific Kitchen Table design archetype lost its legitimacy for NSOs following the 1969 Task Force Report . The report was critical of the fact that amateur sport was governed by part-time volunteers. It argued that the organization of an effective sport delivery system required the concentrated effort of full-time administration. The recommendations of the Task Force were supported by the government and funding was provided to NSOs for the specific purpose of hiring paid staff, freeing volunteer executives from the burden of routine administrative duties, and allowing them to commit their time to the long term objectives of their organization (Munro, 1970, 1971; Task Force Report, 1969). As Munro (1971) declared, "these steps were designed to move the administration of sport off the kitchen table and into a more professional and efficient atmosphere" (p. 2).

The Boardroom Design Archetype

Organizational Values

With the introduction of public interests in amateur sport organizations, the volunteer nonprofit orientation is legitimated by values for providing both public services and satisfying private membership interests. Sources of support come from both private and public donations. That is, general membership, private fundraising, and government agencies interested in the promotion of sport are sources of financial assistance. Values regarding orientation conform to those of volunteer nonprofit organizations. Similar to the Kitchen Table, NSOs are controlled by volunteer executives that direct the policies and resources of the organization. The key difference, however, is that the Boardroom is, in part, supported financially by public agencies (cf. Baka, 1978; Campagnolo, 1977b; Frisby, 1983; Hallett, 1981; Munro, 1970).

Increased public interests and financial support for programs, competitions, and athlete development defines a domain emphasis for NSOs characterized by the development of competitive sport across the country. As

stated by Munro (1970), "the key is more efficient and effective organization through strength in administration leading to involvement through mass participation" (p. 30). In effect, public support enables NSOs to become more than national in name, they become the governing bodies of their sport at all levels of competition. The provision of funds from government agencies gives these NSOs an opportunity to provide more competitions, programs, and national championships.

In addition, with the acceptance of these funds, the domain of the Boardroom, supported by public and private interests, is subject to much more influence from the government than is present in the Kitchen Table. Thus, the domain of the former is more well defined than one supported solely by the private interests characteristic of the latter. In particular, in the Boardroom there is greater pressure to satisfy the government's interest in the development of elite athletes and their performance at international competitions, however, this is only one aspect of a holistic competitive sport delivery system (Campagnolo, 1979; Munro, 1970, 1971).

The refinement in the domain of activities and increased government involvement is supported by values for formal organizational procedures. For example, government involvement during the 1970's focused on "the support of administration—in management services and technical expertise of the national sport governing bodies" (Campagnolo, 1977a, p. 40). Pressured to fulfil the terms and conditions governing the acceptance of financial aid from the public sector, values regarding administrative structure and practices conformed to the bureaucratic administration advanced by the government.

The values espoused by both the government and NSOs supported the idea that the expansion of technical programs (e.g., coaching clinics, training camps, instruction, competitions) required administrative support beyond the capacity of part-time volunteers. For example, during the 1970's and early 1980's, professional staff were hired in response to the substantial growth in NSOs. Paid personnel were hired to take care of the daily administration in an effort to remove the burden of day-to-day managerial duties from the volunteer board and executive members (cf. Baka, 1978; Frisby, 1983; Greaves, 1976; Hallett, 1981; Macintosh et al., 1987; Munro, 1970). As Greaves (1976) states, "the professional staff are not making major policy decisions but they do have an opportunity to suggest and recommend" (p. 50).

Essentially, NSOs focus their attention on the management of their internal affairs regarding planning, organizing, and accounting. Evidence of this is in the fundraising, promotion, public relations, national competitions, and technical development of coaches and officials, which are major concerns for NSOs (cf. Campagnolo, 1979; Regan, 1981). The underlying belief is that direct public financial assistance to NSOs enables them to plan and organize their activities more efficiently.

With values for public interests, a domain which emphasizes competitive sport opportunities, and formally structured organizations, expectations of how to assess the effectiveness of NSOs are a result of values that, similar to the Kitchen Table are oriented toward the organization. The key difference, however, is that evaluation for the Kitchen Table design archetype relies on a subjective analysis of programs while success for the Boardroom design archetype is judged according to operational functions such as the capacity to plan, organize, and implement activities and programs. The major thrust in reinforcing the administrative and technical aspects within NSOs is espoused by Munro (1970) who states, "efforts have been continued and increased to strengthen the organizational structure of the sport bodies ... so that we may be looking forward to an effective, well functioning administrative framework for sports in the near future" (p. 25). Subject to external evaluations as a result of funding dependencies, the success of NSOs involves an assessment of organizational performance vis-à-vis the government and its effectiveness criteria. In essence, NSOs are evaluated in terms of the bureaucratic practices they have in place and the support they provide for domestic and high performance sport program units (cf. Chelladurai et al., 1987; Frisby, 1983; Neill, 1983; Vail, 1986).

Organizational Structure

Distinguished by bureaucratic mechanisms for higher effectiveness and efficiency, the Boardroom is the design archetype of NSOs that, for the most part, emerged during the 1970's and continues to evolve today. Values regarding orientation, domain, principles of organizing, and criteria of effectiveness are expressed in a structural design characterized by formalized procedures, roles, and programs; specialized roles for volunteers; paid staff to assist in daily operating procedures; a formal decision making structure such that positions and lines of authority are explicitly defined; and formal

communication through regularly scheduled board, executive, and committee meetings. A volunteer controlled hierarchy is recognized as the legitimate organizational structure. Specifically, elected volunteer officers direct and control the organization and, they also represent membership interests on the board and the various committees of NSOs.

Macintosh and Whitson (1990) found support for what is labelled here a Boardroom archetype. They reported that members of NSOs were opposed to professionalization, government involvement, and the high performance sport mandate. Rather, the valued domain was one characterized by national program success, but not at the expense of domestic sport for all Canadians. Principles of organizing were characterized by resistance to giving professional staff autonomy in decision making. There was also a lack of commitment to the Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP) and thus the criteria of evaluation for these organizations was not the systematic assessment of high performance sport targets.

Frisby (1983) found that only one NSO reported that paid staff were solely responsible for decision making, this was in the area of promotions. She stated, "this implies that although [NSOs] have decentralized to some degree, they, or their representatives through an executive board, retain control over decision making" (p. 170). Along the same lines, in her description of the administrative structure of the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association [CASA], Greaves (1976) stated,

> the majority of CASA's business is carried on at the Board of Directors' level ... Prior to 1966 there was no comparable body which met throughout the year. In 1975, the Board of Directors increased their meetings from two to three in order to expedite the decision making process and improve communication (p. 28-29).

As pointed out in the Task Force Report (1988), NSOs have moved the decision making structure of their organizations from the "kitchen table" to the "boardroom".

Cunningham et al. (1987), Slack and Hinings (1987), and Macintosh and Whitson (1990) note that this type of design has lost its legitimacy in the institutional environment which has pressured NSOs to focus exclusively on their national high performance sport programs and to introduce more professional control over the direction of their organization. However, conflicts and resistance can arise between interest groups with respect to the appropriate domain and decision making structure (cf. Goldfarb, 1986;

Greaves, 1976; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Thibault, 1987; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). Tension may also develop between volunteers who are geographically dispersed and professional staff that are centrally located. As Macintosh and Whitson (1990) have stated, many volunteer board members have regional interests while the professional staff hold a national perspective. As a result, this design archetype continues to be a viable organizational form for NSOs.

The Executive Office Design Archetype

Organizational Values

The private interests that are characteristic of volunteer nonprofit organizations is of considerably less consequence for the orientation of the Executive Office design archetype than it is in both the Kitchen Table and the Boardroom. Rather it is the sources of legitimation, largely from external public interests, and sources of financial support from government agencies and corporate sponsors that has considerable impact. For example, the introduction of the QPP in 1984, symbolized a federally funded four year commitment to the development of high performance sport for those NSOs on the 1988 Olympic Games program.

The aim of the QPP was to create a climate for winning Olympic medals and World Championships. The focus was on excellence and on the coordination of high performance sport programs in NSOs. The belief was that excellence would be a result of programs that emphasized improved coaching, intensified training, and increased competitive opportunities. More specifically, the QPP was a comprehensive and systematic national quest for international success. In an effort to develop a source of strong international calibre athletes with the potential to win, NSOs were given financial support to develop and implement technical and administrative programs that would make it possible for them to achieve their planned objectives for 1988. Thus, NSOs have moved away from the most fundamental value of the Kitchen Table and to a lesser extent of the Boardroom, that of a "self-help" philosophy. In other words, volunteer nonprofit interests in NSOs have shifted from private to public.

Since the appointment of the first Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, Iona Campagnolo, in 1976, the domain emphasis for NSOs has been moving towards high performance sport—the major goal of the

federal government (cf. Campagnolo, 1977b, 1979; Regan, 1981; Task Force Report, 1988). This narrow and well defined domain of high performance sport is made explicit in the 1988 Task Force Report which stated that a long term goal of Canada's sport delivery system is "to develop a Canadian sport system which will provide opportunities to enable athletes with talent and dedication to win at the highest level of international competition" (p. 56). Specifically, it is NSOs on the Olympic program that have adopted a comprehensive high performance sport domain to cohere with these public interests. Along these lines, Meyer (1979) states that public organizations must focus on " ... the way programmes are articulated or claims to domain asserted" (p. 131). This view may be applied to the context of NSOs where involvement in the high performance sport domain subsequently legitimates the activities of NSOs with their key funding agency, Sport Canada.

In this context, the principles of organizing emphasize the technical knowledge and expertise of those responsible for the development and implementation of standardized programs for success in the international arena. The belief is that committee and executive positions should be filled by individuals with specific expertise rather than by traditional methods of geographical representation characteristic of the Boardroom (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1990; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). In addition, the roles of professional staff are more sophisticated and detailed than those of the Boardroom. For example, the role of the national coach is much more than one that simply coaches athletes at practices and competitions. Rather it is one that is responsible for the technical and administrative functioning of the national team program. In conjunction with a National Team Coordinator, responsibilities include developing training schedules, organizing training camps, and representing the interests of the national team at executive and board meetings. In addition, full-time professional staff, such as Marketing Directors and Program and Communication Directors are hired to attract corporate sponsorship and enhance public appeal.

A significant aspect associated with the proper roles, rules, and reporting relationships is that the responsibilities for volunteers and professionals are very different from those in the Boardroom. As espoused in the Task Force Report (1988), the belief is that,

> volunteers will always be essential to the direction and delivery of the sport system, but as their system grows in magnitude and complexity the leadership and management of the system will be provided, more and

> more, by professionally trained full-time sport managers and technical staff responsible to their volunteer Boards of Directors (p. 31).

In terms of control systems, then, the idea in the Executive Office is that the volunteer board has executive type responsibilities such as coordinating, advising, and approving policy. The belief is that professional staff are more "in touch" with the national perspective and thus, are responsible for developing and implementing national policy, while the volunteer role is largely responsible for implementing the national program perspective at local and regional levels (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Hinings, 1987; Task Force Report, 1988).

One reason for the viability of "professional" control within a "volunteer" orientation is the emphasis on international success and financial accountability as the evaluative criteria for NSOs. For these organizations, the key constituent is Sport Canada, whose interest and funding supports the production and success of elite international athletes. It is the evaluation of international sport success and budget expenditures, therefore, that provide evidence that the organization is meeting its planned objectives and engaging in activities that confer legitimacy by the institutional environment (i.e., donors of substantial resources). Thus, for NSOs, high performance sport goals, made explicit through the federally funded QPP, provide an evaluative tool for their success.

With the introduction of the QPP in 1984, the ultimate objective was to "develop more meaningful data gathering and analysis techniques ... define in more specific terms and make more meaningful to NSOs the concept of athlete and system performance indicators" (Task Force Report, 1988, p. 37). In its evaluation of NSOs, the funding agency (i.e., Sport Canada) was concerned with criteria such as medal performances and world championship standings to assess high performance sport objectives. The expectations of what was required to meet these criteria were espoused by the public funding agency which was striving "to ensure that appropriate indicators are integrated into the NSO Quadrennial Plans, and in so doing, establish a collective set of Canadian high performance indicators" (Task Force Report, 1988, p. 37).

The fact that criteria are more concrete than those of the Boardroom and considerably more than those of the Kitchen Table, is an indication that values regarding effectiveness have shifted from subjective to objective

evaluations. Vail (1986) found that presidents and executive directors of NSOs considered the ability of their organization to acquire and manage funds to be an essential component of the effectiveness of NSOs. She stated,

> now ... [NSOs] may be placing greater pressure on themselves to plan and control their finances and to identify additional funding sources. In addition, potential funding agencies are demanding that [NSOs] be more accountable for their financial expenditures. Presidents and executive directors are now very much involved in developing marketing strategies and financial systems (p. 67).

It should be noted that Vail's study took place in the 1984-1985 fiscal year, the first year of QPP implementation.

Organizational Structure

These values for public support, a domain emphasis on high performance sport, professional planning, and objective performance criteria are made concrete in an organizational design represented by both bureaucratic systems of organization and professional expertise. For example, during the mid 1980's, national sport governing bodies (NSGBs) came to be regarded as national sport organizations (NSOs). This labelling change symbolizes the shift in the frame of reference for what organizational form is valued. The common understanding of how to operate an "organization" is very different from that of a "governing body" characteristic of the Boardroom. Whereas the latter is represented by national, provincial, and local volunteer interests in overseeing the operations of their sport in Canada, the "organization" is represented by professional and national interests in systematically controlling the direction of their sport.

It is in this context that the organizational design of NSOs has been described as "corporate-professional" (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). As Macintosh (1985) stated, "in the short span of a decade and a half, sports administration changed from the 'Kitchen Table', volunteer leadership operation described in the 1969 Report of the task force on sports for Canadians to a large full-time, highly technical and professional work force" (p. 390). In other words, by emphasizing the value of professional staff as the primary leaders over the operations and the process of planning and policy development, focus is placed on decision making not in the "boardroom" but rather in the "executive office".

A significant aspect of the Executive Office design archetype is the role of professional staff employed by NSOs. With the introduction of the QPP,

change in NSOs was initiated "by requiring sport organizations to rethink their goals and objectives and introduce new organizational structures and processes" (Hinings & Slack, 1987, p. 129). To accomplish this, the structural design that was advocated within the institutional environment was one where decisions regarding policy and programs were made by professional staff (Kidd, 1988; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990).

During the 1984-1988 period, there was a considerable increase in the number of professional and support staff employed by NSOs because of the needs and demands of the growth in their programs and services as a result of QPP implementation. In contrast to the professionalization presiding in the Boardroom, where paid personnel are hired in ***response*** to program and service changes, this time period saw the hiring of professional staff to ***carry out*** specific program changes (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Task Force Report, 1988).

The qualitative difference between the Boardroom archetype and the Executive Office archetype is one which demonstrates a shift in control from volunteers to professionals. More specifically, there is movement away from a broad decision making structure involving a variety of interests toward a narrow decision making structure involving expert judgement (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988). In effect, the board plays a fundraising and advisory role while professional staff use their expertise for developing programs and policies. In their study, Macintosh and Whitson found one example of a NSO that resembled what they called a "corporate-volunteer" structure and has been labelled here an Executive Office archetype. This NSO was characterized by commitment to the domain of high performance sport, a professional mode of organizing, and objective criteria of evaluation (e.g., QPP).

Recent literature has argued that this archetype is the institutionally prescribed form for NSOs today, however, the observation is that only a few NSOs actually operate in this design (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). Organized around the high performance sport domain and structured around professional control, NSOs in this archetype are legitimized by their success in attaining their high performance sport objectives. Volunteer committees are developed around special expertise to handle specific problems, while professional staff oversee the operations and direction of the organization.

Nevertheless, resistance seems to stem from internal forces for volunteer control at the core of both the Kitchen Table and the Boardroom (cf. Goldfarb, 1986; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Pugliese & Taylor, 1977; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988).

Discussion and Conclusion

For the purpose of uncovering the design archetypes specific to NSOs, the underlying organizational values and their structural manifestations have been specified. The Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office design archetypes are models or patterns of structure-value relationships that are "ideal type" representations of NSOs. As representative types, however, no single NSO may mirror exactly the structure and values of the archetype to which they aspire or belong. In McKinney's (1966) terms, " ... a primary role of the constructed type would seem to be that of a sensitizing device" (p. 216). The perspective taken in this study is that, as reference points, these three design archetypes provide useful insights into the issue of strategic change and other organizational phenomena. They also liberate researchers from a static view of structural design.

Rather than categorizing organizations and inferring the possibility of change based on those classifications; as means for understanding changes in organizational design, this framework focuses on understanding the designs of organizations, not only in terms of structural elements they do and do not share, but in terms of the different values they hold (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b). By introducing the coherence of structure and values, institutionally specific design archetypes provide models to assist our understanding of designs that are most viable for a set of organizations. In addition, the idea that structures are underpinned by values moves us beyond static classifications of organizational design and introduces the dynamics of strategic change.

From a general perspective, the identification of these institutionally specific design archetypes provides a basis for describing the natural development and growth of NSOs toward a more professional and bureaucratic form. The most frequently documented transition is from a Kitchen Table design archetype to either a Boardroom or Executive Office design archetype (cf. Cunningham et al., 1987; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack, 1985; Task Force Report, 1988).

Beyond the evolutionary view of this change, however, it is the identification of the values that underpin the structural arrangements of these organizations which supports an argument that movement toward a more professional and bureaucratic form requires more than a simple adoption of rules and specialized roles. By describing design archetypes along structural arrangements that reflect these values, this chapter emphasizes that the fundamental differences are qualitative in nature. For example, where an Executive Office is structured around values for government involvement, a high performance sport domain, professionalization, and objective measures of evaluation, the Kitchen Table design archetype is emphasized by values for self-help, a broad domain of activities, volunteer control, and subjective assessments of effectiveness.

Given the mutually supporting relationship among values and structure, there is an implicit resistance to whole scale changes in direction or archetypical change. As Miller (1987) states, archetypes or what he calls configurations, "have an internal logic, integrity, and evolutionary momentum of their own, as well as a central, enduring theme that unifies and organizes them. This gives them great stability" (p. 697). Regardless of the presence of external pressures for change, therefore, there is the possibility that the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office may be constantly renewed. Thus, the importance of establishing these sector specific design archetypes is to facilitate our understanding of the difficulty NSOs have in instituting whole scale changes in their structures and systems that are tightly coupled to organizational values.

Greenwood and Hinings' (1988) "reorientation track", Miller and Friesen's (1980) "transition archetypes", and Tushman and Romanelli's (1985) "re-creations" move beyond adaptive models of change to include reorganizations of such magnitude that they require whole scale shifts in structures, systems, and values. Greenwood and Hinings' concept of "tracks" focuses on the temporal association between values and structure. They state that change is present for all organizations, however, it is the rate and pattern of change which varies. For example, organizations within an archetype, change in such a way that provides inertial forces for the continued development and elaboration of present structural arrangements. In addition, a successful reorientation depends not only on the decoupling of present values and structures but on the forces that are both external and

internal to the organization which enable or constrain change. Consequently, the direction an organization moves depends on the degree of coherence between structural arrangements with both the internal values of organizational members and the external environment (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a).

It is in this respect that these design archetypes can inform researchers in their efforts to describe and analyze NSOs in terms of their similarities and differences not purely in structural terms, rather as efforts to realize substantially different values. In reference to NSOs, some organizations may have become entrenched in a Boardroom design archetype demonstrating a limited degree of "professionalization". Other NSOs may have moved from a Boardroom to an Executive Office at one time, yet may have reversed their position back toward a Boardroom. Still others may have transformed from a Kitchen Table design archetype to either a Boardroom or an Executive Office.

Building on theoretical and empirical work on amateur sport organizations in Canada, the underlying thesis of this chapter was that sector specific design archetypes can be uncovered in order to conceptually understand the change process in NSOs. This analysis suggests that an understanding of NSOs in their sector helps identify the limited number of coherent organizational designs that are most significant for these organizations. This chapter does not explain the process of change nor does it analyze why some NSOs have adopted a particular design archetype. To do this requires an indepth examination of NSOs over time.

Nevertheless, the design archetypes uncovered in this chapter hold much promise for future investigations. They may prove useful for classifying organizations according to archetypical characteristics to see how closely organizations represent them and how far they are distributed away from them. It will also prove useful to assess the changes in organizations with respect to archetypical characteristics. The analysis of structural patterns in light of organizational values can thus enlighten the debates surrounding viable organizational forms. As Hallett (1981) stated,

> national single agency sport governing bodies will survive or disappear on the public's need ... these organizations will continue to grow and expand depending on their involvement in the Olympics and/or other international sporting events. The international arena gives these associations [and their funding agency] a focus—a real single-minded purpose (p. 785).

To investigate this claim, however, more extensive research concerning the extent to which NSOs reflect these designs is required.

The Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office design archetypes identify the specific conditions for value-structure coherence in NSOs that should be considered when trying to understand the variety in organizational design and the patterns of strategic change in these organizations. More specifically, by identifying the most representative design archetypes for NSOs, this chapter will serve as a framework for understanding the shifts in structural design elements that have had a significant impact on the organizational forms for this institutionally specific set of organizations.

Bibliography

Baka, R.S.P. (1978). A history of provincial government involvement in sport in western Canada. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Broom, E.F., & Baka, R.S.P. (1979). Canadian governments and sport. Ottawa: Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Sociology of Sport Monograph Series.

Campagnolo, I. (1977a). Sportfuture. Journal of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 44 , 3-5; 37-40.

Campagnolo, I. (1977b). Toward a national policy on amateur sport: A working paper. Ottawa: Minister of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Campagnolo, I. (1979). Partners in pursuit of excellence: A national policy on amateur sport. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Chelladurai, P., Szyszlo, M., & Haggerty, T.R. (1987). Systems-based dimensions of effectiveness: The case of national sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 12, 111-119.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. Sociology, 6, 1-22.

Child, J. (1988). On organizations in their sectors. Organization Studies, 9, 13-19.

Child, J., & Smith, C. (1987). The context and process of organizational transformation-Cadbury Limited in its sector. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 565-593.

Cunningham, D., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Changing design archetypes in amateur sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 59-81). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

DiMaggio, P. (1983). State expansion and organizational fields. In R.H. Hall & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), Organizational theory and public policy (pp. 147-161). Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1990). Issue: High performance management issues, a group discussion. Proceedings of For excellence: A symposium on Canadian high performance sport (pp. 50-51). February 12-14, 1989. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Frisby, W. (1983). The organizational structure and effectiveness of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.

Frisby, W. (1986). The organizational structure and effectiveness of voluntary organizations: The case of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 4, 61-74.

Goldfarb Consultants. (1986, May). The state of the volunteer-professional relationship in amateur sport in Canada. A research report for the Canadian Olympic Association.

Greaves, H.R. (1976). The sports development policy of the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association: 1961-1976. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization Studies, 9, 293-316.

Hallett, W.D. (1981). A history of federal government involvement in the development of sport in Canada: 1943-1979. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Hinings, C.R., Brown, J.L., & Greenwood, R. (1991). Change in an autonomous professional organization. Journal of Management Studies, 28, 375-393.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988a). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988b). The normative prescription of organizations. In L.G. Zucker (Ed.), Institutional patterns and organizations (pp. 53-70). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger.

Hinings, C.R., & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of quadrennial plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack & C. R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 127-151). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Howell, M.L., & Howell, R.A. (1985). Canadian sport in perspective. In M.L. Howell & R.A. Howell (Eds.), History of sport in Canada (revised edition) (pp. 396-417). Champaign, Illinois: Stipes.

Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class, power, and the Canadian state. In P.J. Galasso (Ed.), Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R., & Zimmermann, A. (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. Journal of Sport Management, 3, 129-150.

Kimberly, J.R. (1987). The study of organization: Toward a biographical perspective. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 223-237). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kimberly, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 595-622.

Lappage, R. (1985). The Canadian scene and sport: 1921-1939. In M.L. Howell & R.A. Howell (Eds.), History of sport in Canada (revised edition) (pp. 224-302). Champaign, Illinois: Stipes.

Laughlin, R.C. (1991). Environmental disturbances and organizational transitions and transformations: Some alternative models. Organization Studies, 12, 209-232.

Macintosh, D. (1985). The Canadian sport scene since 1976. In M.L. Howell & R.A. Howell (Eds.), History of sport in Canada (revised edition) (pp. 384-395). Champaign, Illinois: Stipes.

Macintosh, D. (1988). The federal government and voluntary sport associations. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 121-139). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Macintosh, D., Bedecki, T., & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). Sport and politics in Canada: Federal government involvement since 1961. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McKinney, J.C. (1966). Constructive typology and social theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 340-363.

Meyer, M.W. (1979). Change in public bureaucracies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, D. (1987). The genesis of configuration. Academy of Management Review, 12, 686-701.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1980). Archetypes of organizational transition. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 268-292.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1984). Organization: A quantum view. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Munro, J. (1970). A proposed sports policy for Canadians. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.

Munro, J. (1971). Sport Canada/Recreation Canada. A report presented to the National Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport. May 7, 1971.

Neill, S.E. (1983). A descriptive-analytical model for national sport governing bodies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., & Hinings, C.R. (1969). An empirical taxonomy of structures of work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 115-126.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., & Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organizational structure. Administrative Science Quarterly, 13, 65-105.

Pugliese, D., & Taylor, B. (1977). Sport and the volunteer at the national level. Ottawa: National Sport and Recreation Centre Inc.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 1-17.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley & G. Salaman (Eds.), The international yearbook of organizational studies (pp. 197-221). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Regan, G. (1981). A challenge to the nation: Fitness and amateur sport in the 80s. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Sawula, L.W. (1977). The national physical fitness act of Canada: 1943-1954. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Schrodt, B. (1983). Changes in the governance of amateur sport in Canada. Canadian Journal of History of Sport, 14, 1-20.

Slack, T. (1985). The bureaucratization of a voluntary sport organization. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 20 , 145-166.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., & Thibault, L. (1988). Values and beliefs: Their role in structuring of national sport organizations. Arena Review, 12, 140-155.

Task Force Report. (1969). Report of the task force on sports for Canadians. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.

Task Force Report. (1988). Toward 2000: The report of the task force on national sport policy. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Thibault, L. (1987). The dynamics of plan implementation in national sport organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Tushman, M.L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 7 (pp. 171-222). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Vail, S.E. (1986). Organizational effectiveness and national sport governing bodies: A constituency approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

Walsh, K., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Ranson, S. (1981). Power and advantage in organizations. Organization Studies, 2, 131-152.

Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1988). The professionalization of Canadian amateur sport: Questions of power and purpose. Arena Review, 12, 81-96.

Zucker, L.G., (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. American Sociological Review, 42, 726-743.

CHAPTER III

Patterns of Organizational Design Change in National Sport Organizations

Between 1984 and 1988, national sport organizations (NSOs) faced changes more profound in their implications and more fundamental in their transformative capacity than at any period since the inception of the present Canadian sport delivery system in the early 1970's. The precursor of these changes was the Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP). Initiated by Sport Canada (the federal government agency responsible for the delivery of amateur sport in Canada), the QPP represented a pivotal-point for many NSOs. It was during this time that the task of these organizations, particularly those on the Olympic program, was focused toward the development of administrative and technical practices to enhance the performance of elite athletes at international competitions.

The success of Canada's athletes at the 1984 summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles and host nation status for the 1988 winter Olympic Games in Calgary prompted a heightening of the federal government's interest in high performance sport (Kidd, 1988; Macintosh, Bedecki, & Franks, 1987). A government task force reported on the status of technical programs and the financial requirements of a "Best Ever" performance in 1988. As a result, in 1983 the "Winter Best Ever" program was approved with $25 million in government support. In July 1984, the program was extended for summer Olympic sports with an additional $37.2 million in funding. Planning meetings conducted by Sport Canada helped NSOs develop high performance plans and objectives for 1988. Each NSO developed a long term plan and submitted it to Sport Canada for review. Funding was allotted to each NSO based on the evaluation of their plan. NSOs then refined and began to implement their plans over the 1984-1988 period (Fitness & Amateur Sport, 1982-83; 1983-84; 1986-87).

Hinings and Slack (1987) note,

> the introduction of a system such as Quadrennial Planning raises a number of theoretical (and practical) issues. The most relevant and timely of these is the organizational changes required by a sport organization both as a consequence of their plans and as a result of the operation of the planning system itself (p. 128).

Similarly, Slack and Hinings (1987) argue that organizational plans are formalized intentions to change certain programs and/or practices. For NSOs, therefore, the criticality of the QPP is its objective of " ... producing change by requiring sport organizations to rethink their goals and objectives and by introducing new organizational processes" (p. 186).

Although external pressures tied to the provision of financial resources are critical to understanding planned changes in NSOs, Powell and Friedkin (1987), discussing change in nonprofit organizations, make an important point that relates to our understanding of change in NSOs, when they state, "exclusive focus on resource dependency would miss elements of the organization's structure and political processes that also facilitated its ability to adapt" (p. 187). It is important, therefore, to realize the changes that took place in NSOs throughout the QPP, were influenced by both external and internal forces.

With a formal planning system in place for the development of elite sport, NSOs required more technical and administrative expertise. As a result, the job descriptions and roles of paid staff became more specialized and detailed. Essentially, during the QPP one of the most significant pressures on NSOs was a push toward increased professional control over decision making. Such changes require a reorientation away from traditional values of centralized decision making at the voluntary board level to values that support decentralized decision making at the level of professional staff. What was required was a qualitative change in the organizational design of NSOs (Slack & Hinings, 1987).

Traced to the external influence of increased funding for high performance sport programs and the desire of some individuals (e.g., new professional administrators, the senior staff of Sport Canada) to adopt a more "rational" organizational form, the changes during this period were consequential for the organizational design of NSOs. The QPP itself, was " ... a vehicle for the introduction of new and different goals, structures, and systems in sport organizations" (Slack & Kikulis, 1989, p. 190). For most NSOs, the introduction and implementation of their quadrennial plans was quite disruptive, requiring whole scale shifts in strategy, structure, and process. Nadler and Tushman (1989) state, such changes " ... are profound for the organization and its members because they usually influence organizational values regarding employees, customers, competition, or

products" (p. 194). In effect, the heightened interest in high performance sport, the QPP and the funding attached to it, and the changing roles of professional staff had a substantial impact on the infrastructure of NSOs.

Several researchers have examined the QPP, its impact on the Canadian sport delivery system, and the accompanying structural changes in NSOs. In particular, Hinings and Slack (1987) and Macintosh and Whitson (1990) claim that although the QPP has increased the pace of change toward professionally run organizations, there is variety in the organizational design of NSOs and the nature of this change has not been uniform.

The focus of this chapter is on issues of organizational design and the patterns of change between design types that have occurred during the QPP. Drawing on both recent work on organizational change and studies of the Canadian sport delivery system, the following section discusses the significance of coherent organizational designs for understanding patterns of change and the importance of identifying those attributes or "high impact systems" of an organization which signal whole scale changes between organizational designs. Based on these theoretical arguments, the next section outlines the propositions developed about the changes in the organizational design of NSOs. Results from the empirical analysis are presented, followed by a discussion on the implication of these findings for understanding organizational change in NSOs.

Theoretical Background

Underlying the framework for studying change established in Chapter II, was the rationale that it is the coherence between structural design elements and member's values that is the basis for understanding the variety in organizational design and the patterns of organizational change. As Hinings and Greenwood (1988) state,

> any set of structures is an expression of a set of values and ideas about the organization and appropriate ways of organizing. It is the means of operationalizing purposes, goals and objectives. As such, structures are imbued with values and commitments and serve particular interests, which make the process of providing and managing transformations difficult (p. 22-23).

These complementary structure-value configurations develop internal forces for stability which resist change (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Miller & Friesen, 1984).

Support for this approach was provided by introducing three design archetypes that represent institutionally specific coherent value-structure relationships for NSOs: Kitchen Table, Boardroom, and Executive Office. These design archetypes were constructed from both theoretical and empirical data. Historical referents provided specific details of actual situations and the sequence of relevant events for NSOs, while empirical studies provided evidence of recurrent organizational types for this set of organizations. Together, these data helped to identify the design archetypes that most significantly represented the situation for NSOs.

In arguing for the construction of types to guide scientific inquiry, McKinney (1966) states, "the constructed type is a heuristic expedient that serves as a means by which concrete occurrences can be compared and comprehended within a system of general categories presumably underlying the types" (p. 7). Viewed as methodological tools to assist scientific observation and prediction, the primary contribution of the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office design archetypes is that they enable organizations to be described in terms that are comparable. As scientific constructs, "types" help identify, simplify, and order data for comparisons (McKinney, 1966).

It is probable that empirical cases may more often than not, reveal approximations or deviations from constructed types (McKinney, 1966). The important point is that, like "ideal types", design archetypes provide a conceptual basis for understanding phenomena, in this case, organizational change. Support for this claim is provided by Hinings and Greenwood (1988) who state "understanding change requires examining how far any particular organization is moving from one design archetype to another and how far its current situation shows design coherence" (p. 23). As models to guide classification, sector specific design archetypes make it possible to describe the transitions of each organization within a sector according to the extent to which it reflects the patterns of structure and value coherence (i.e., design archetypes) that are most often identified for the sector.

Past understandings of change in NSOs have suggested that external pressures since the 1970's have contributed to the movement away from the Kitchen Table archetype toward the Boardroom archetype and, subsequent pressures during the 1980's have resulted in further movement toward an Executive Office archetype (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson,

1990; Regan, 1981; Task Force Report, 1988). In an evolutionary sense, it is possible to view these design archetypes as forming a chronological pattern in which organizations began as Kitchen Table designs and gradually became more structured and sophisticated adopting either a Boardroom design or an Executive Office design. Structure and change, however, involve variation (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1998; Miller & Friesen, 1980; Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

To go beyond asking what design archetypes exist for NSOs, it is necessary to assess the degree to which NSOs approximate these design archetypes and the role these constructions play in understanding change. In an analytic sense, then, design archetypes can be operationalized and tested empirically. The extent to which an organization approximates either the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, or the Executive Office serves as the basis for explaining the variety in organizational design and subsequent patterns of change.

Patterns of Change

Greenwood and Hinings (1988), Hinings and Greenwood (1988), Miller and Friesen (1980), Nadler and Tushman (1989), and Tushman and Romanelli (1985) have all identified different patterns of change within and between organizations. In general, these authors advocate an evolution-revolution model of change. Evolutionary change applies when the organization makes incremental adjustments in strategy, structure, and/or systems. Alternatively, revolutionary change occurs in response to or, in anticipation of, major environmental or strategic changes which require " ... simultaneous and sharp shifts in strategy, power, structure, and controls" (Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986, p. 31). In effect, organizations moving from one design archetype to another are involved in revolutionary change (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988).

Periods of evolutionary change may occur when cohesive organizations (i.e., organizations with archetypical status) develop internal forces for stability or "momentum" which reinforce or heighten their current organizational design (Miller & Friesen, 1984). According to Greenwood and Hinings (1988), such organizations evolve in the same direction and follow an ***inertial*** pattern. Organizations may also make evolutionary or incremental changes in their structures and systems in the direction of the design archetype to which they aspire but do not yet belong. Organizations

following this ***convergent*** pattern tend to build on current structural arrangements as a guide for future adjustments toward a coherent organizational design.

When substantial or revolutionary changes are expected, both existing and new organizational configurations are particularly important in understanding the patterns of movement between design archetypes. In essence, movement between design archetypes involves a transformation of the "whole" organization. Nadler and Tushman (1989) suggest, that these types of changes "frequently involve breaking out of a current pattern of congruence and helping an organization develop a completely new configuration" (p. 196). Such a move to a new design type requires changes that Miller and Friesen (1984) call "quantum", Nadler and Tushman (1989) call "frame-breaking", and the term used in this chapter is Hinings and Greenwood's (1988) ***reorientation.***

Organizations that embark on a movement to a new design archetype are not always successful. Hinings and Greenwood (1988) found that organizations may make initial movements in a new direction and then reverse this direction back toward their original state. Quinn (1982) and Starbuck, Greve, and Hedberg (1978) have argued that organizational design elements can change independently and these changes will not disrupt the ongoing functioning of the organization. Consequently, organizations following a ***reversal*** pattern may make large or small changes in one area and in assessing these changes decide to revert back to their initial organizational design. In addition, externally driven revolutionary change that has a specific transition period may not provide enough time for some organizations to achieve new design coherence by the end of the prescribed change period. Consequently, organizations undergoing reorientations may exhibit an ***unresolved*** pattern of change.

The diversity of patterns of change indicates that organizations do not simply adjust to pressures occurring in the environment. What constrains or enables change is the internal and external forces that combine to influence the direction of organizational change (Child, 1972). As Miller and Friesen (1984) state, "the prime need is to get away from looking at unitary relationships among elements of structure, and to stand back and try to understand a multiplicity of fundamental response patterns of organizations in all their complexity" (p. 151). Thus, it is the extent to which organizations

make whole scale changes to new designs or make incremental changes to achieve or maintain design coherence that is reflected in the patterns of change.

High Impact Systems

Recently, approaches to understanding such changes in organizations have moved beyond just looking at structural change and have focused on the role of values in defining organizational design coherence. Such an approach is exemplified in the work of Greenwood and Hinings (1988), Hinings and Greenwood (1988), Nadler and Tushman (1989), Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood (1980), Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, and Walsh (1980), and Tushman and Romanelli (1985). As suggested by Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood, "organizational structure is not only a formal configuration of roles, rules, and procedures ... but a vehicle constructed to reflect and facilitate meaning" (p. 2-3). More specifically, Greenwood and Hinings identify core values as those that are central to the organization's purpose. It is important, therefore, to identify the value premises of institutionally specific archetypes first and then identify what elements are crucial for those organizations or types. It is those elements that embody the core values of the organization which Hinings and Greenwood label "high impact systems".

> The idea of high impact systems is that in the majority of organizations there are aspects of organizational design which have a high impact in terms of the messages encoded within them and in terms of the extent to which they underpin prevailing ideas of purpose and organizational character (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988, p. 113).

Essentially, the concept of high impact systems emphasizes that, the coupling of values and structure varies between structural and systemic elements (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). Some aspects of organizational design are more tightly coupled to value preferences and thus have a stronger impact on the structuring of organizations. In effect, high impact systems are those that mark the difference between archetypes. On the one hand, it is high impact systems that must be changed to signal whole scale changes to a new design archetype because they are tightly coupled to the values which give meaning to the organization. On the other hand, as Tushman and Romanelli (1985) state, "core values are the most pervasive aspect of organizations in that they set basic constraints as to where, how, and why a[n

organization] competes" (p. 175). Thus, it may be in the interest of organizational members to resist such changes.

Kanter's (1983) discussion of cultural change gets at the issue of high impact systems. She suggests that organizational values made concrete in structures and systems are "action vehicles" which act as a primary force for guiding cultural change. More specifically, the change is given an identity when it is expressed in concrete action. That is, changes in core values take hold when they are reflected in the organization's structure and systems. Cultural change (i.e., new values, norms, expectations), therefore, requires identification of those values which signal change. As Kanter states, "out of all the events and elements making up an innovation [or change], what is the core that needs to be preserved? What is the essence of [change]?" (p. 300). For changes to become legitimate, they must be institutionalized in the values of the organization. When values are not consistent with those that are traditionally held, they will not be manifest in the organization's structure (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kanter, 1983; Quinn & McGrath, 1985). Consequently, initiating a change requires defining the specific attributes or high impact system that makes the change legitimate.

Kanter (1983) further argues that, when there is a lack of understanding about the organization, sweeping changes are made. There is a feeling that something has to be changed but the key element has not been identified. In such cases, organizational members are unsure of " ... which aspects of the culture and structure they have built are critical, and which could be profitably and safely modified" (p. 302). They are missing the critical structural or systemic element(s) of the organization's culture that makes the change successful.

Quinn and McGrath (1985) state that the most central aspect of organizational culture:

> ... involves beliefs about the 'appropriate' nature of transactions. Whenever an interaction takes place, valued things (facts, ideas, affection, permission, and so on) are exchanged. These transactions or exchanges determine identity, power, and satisfaction. These governing rules about the nature of transactions tend to be deeply embedded values that are usually dormant but that contain explosive potential (p. 325).

In organizations, transactions are guided by their decision making structures. An important aspect of recent theorizing is that choices and decisions are closely linked to organizational values. For example, in an effort to maintain the current organizational values and activities, decision

making structures are used by organizational members to influence the goals, priorities, relationships, and communication processes. In essence, decision making structures establish standards of behaviour and interactions which unify, link, and satisfy organizational members forming the core of the organization's culture (cf. Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Quinn & McGrath, 1985).

Hinings and Greenwood (1988) found decision making patterns and decision making criteria to be high impact systems for a sector of local government organizations. Beyer (1981) has also identified a strong link between ideologies, values, and decision making. In a similar way, research on NSOs has found strong value commitments to the decision making structures of these organizations (cf. Fitness & Amateur Sport, 1990; Goldfarb, 1986; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). It is not surprising, therefore, that a recurrent issue in the analysis of change in NSOs is the role played by volunteers and professionals in decision making. As noted in a recent federal government report,

> decision-making and policy development in the NSOs are pivotal issues. Who makes decisions and how problems are resolved are concerns ... Much of the decision-making process entails clarifying who should/must be involved in the decision, who has the final authority in the decision, is the process written down, and how is the decision announced? (Fitness & Amateur Sport, 1990, p. 50).

In a comprehensive analysis of the perceptions of volunteers and professionals regarding the organization and operation of their sport, Goldfarb's (1986) results stated that the most contentious issue in amateur sport organizations is the division of responsibility over decision making between volunteers and professionals with respect to policy development. He found that professionals desire more input into the process, however, volunteers fear that this input will challenge their control of the organization. In a sense, for NSOs, volunteer controlled decision making defines the fundamental culture of these organizations. Changing the decision making structure of NSOs involves changing values that have influenced the functioning of these organizations since their origin. As Tushman et al. (1986) state, "organizational history is a source of tradition, precedent, and pride which are in turn anchors to the past ... and may be a source of resistance to change" (p. 35). As a result, any attempt to change this tradition may have what Quinn and McGrath (1985) call an "explosive potential" and what Greenwood and Hinings (1988) call a "high impact" on the organizational design of NSOs. Decision making structures are, then,

crucial design parameters in many organizations, including NSOs, and therefore, must be addressed in a more systematic manner when trying to understand organizational change. It is in this sense that decision making structures may be considered as high impact systems of change for NSOs.

The underlying argument that has been presented thus far is that decision making structures have an important link with the values of organizational members and thus may be considered what Greenwood and Hinings (1988) and Hinings and Greenwood (1988) have called "high impact systems". Since high impact systems are interwoven with the values which underpin the structural design of organizations, it is a fundamental change in these elements that enables and/or constrains archetypical change (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). As Hinings and Greenwood state, "there is an important research issue which distinguishes more clearly between the meaning of the various commonly used elements of structure and systems in particular design archetypes and their subsequent role in the change process" (p. 204). The suggestion, then, that decision making is a high impact system for NSOs seems fruitful for explaining changes resulting from the need to adapt their structures and systems to internal and external pressures for change. The implication is that decision making may be highly significant for understanding the movement of organizations between design archetypes.

Purpose & Propositions

The theoretical framework outlined in Chapter II lays the groundwork for establishing the existence of institutionally specific design archetypes for NSOs. What remains to be explained is the process of change and why some NSOs have adopted a particular design archetype. The preceding discussion of the QPP period suggests the structural design of NSOs will display certain reactions to this pressure for change. This leads to interesting questions of how closely NSOs represent these design archetypes and what are the patterns of change of these organizations during this period. Given that design archetypes are identified as coherent structural designs reinforced by values, beliefs, and ideas (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988), then, the argument put forward in Chapter II, that design archetypes are useful tools to understand organizational change, may be examined by assessing the degree and direction of change in these elements over time. By exploring a set of propositions, the aim in this chapter is to report and analyze

the structural changes that occurred in NSOs during the 4 year period following the introduction of the QPP.

Throughout the 1970's and early 1980's, the core values in NSOs, anchored in traditional voluntary control, remained relatively stable. In effect, structural and systemic changes were made within the existing hierarchy of centralized decision making authority at the level of the voluntary board (cf. Pugliese & Taylor, 1977). Prior to the QPP, then, there was no explicit pressure to adopt a particular design archetype, however, the increasing complexity of Canada's sport delivery system did favour NSOs that demonstrated a degree of administrative efficiency and a coordinated hierarchy of control (Kidd, 1988; Macintosh et al., 1987). Thus, the first proposition states that:

> ***1. NSOs will exhibit a variety of structural designs during 1984.***

On the one hand, the introduction of the QPP required that NSOs plan and implement certain changes in their structures and systems which would move them toward an Executive Office design archetype. On the other hand, 4 years is a relatively short period of time for substantial changes to occur. Given the time constraints (1984-1988) for the effective implementation of change, it is further proposed that:

> ***2. In 1986 and 1988, the structural designs of NSOs will show that the general direction of change has been toward either a Boardroom or an Executive Office archetype.***

Having established the existing structural designs across time periods, the next step will be to demonstrate the contribution that institutionally specific design archetypes make to understanding patterns of change in NSOs. In particular, the way in which structural elements have changed will be assessed by considering what Miller and Friesen (1984) call the relational aspect of configurations. The relational argument of configurations states that patterns of change depend upon the degree to which adjustments in the internal alignment of structural elements is disruptive for a cohesive organizational design (cf. Miller & Friesen, 1984). These authors discuss the continuity in evolutionary patterns of change where the relations between variables are preserved and thus so is the organizational design. They also

discuss the condition where there are whole scale changes such that new associations between variables are achieved and thus, a new design is adopted. While reasons have been given to expect that this sector of organizations should be moving toward an Executive Office archetype, the issues to be addressed here are, how substantial has this change been and, have all NSOs been affected in a similar way? Consequently, it is proposed that:

> *3. Throughout the 1984-1988 period, NSOs will exhibit a variety of patterns of change.*

The concept of the design archetype stipulates that structure is an expression of values which serve particular interests (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988). Greenwood and Hinings (1988), Nadler and Tushman (1989), Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood (1980), and Tushman and Romanelli (1985) have, all in their own way, argued that the difficulty in reorientation or organizational wide change is the attachment of values to established structures and systems. Thus, movement between archetypes is difficult. To achieve such a change requires abandoning existing values for which there are strong institutional ties. In the case of amateur sport organizations in Canada, it has been argued that voluntary led decision making structures symbolize the legitimate, rational way to organize decision making in this sector of organizations. This supports the view that decision making structures are tightly coupled to the core values of these organizations and that decision making is in fact a high impact system. Thus, the final proposition is:

> *4. Organizations that have adopted a new design archetype will demonstrate the greatest change in the high impact system of decision making.*

Methods

Sample and Data Collection

The QPP, which provides the context in which to investigate the above propositions, represents a major financial commitment to improving the high performance programs of NSOs. The 4 year planning program was expected to have a major impact on the structure and function of NSOs as they implemented their plans to increase their chances of fielding their "Best

Ever" athletes at the 1988 Olympic Games. It is this criteria that delineates the scope of organizations to be considered in this study. As Miller and Friesen (1984) have noted, "narrow samples can be useful to uncover individual configurations intuitively, and to describe them in depth ... " (p. 18). Specifically, it is the 36 NSOs involved in the 1988 Olympic Games that developed a quadrennial plan, which defines the population of organizations to be analyzed.

It is important to conduct real time longitudinal studies of change in order to best capture the variety in organizational design and the patterns of change. It is important to note that the data were collected at specific intervals during this time: 1984, 1986, and 1988. These data, collected from documents and interviews with key professional staff (e.g., Technical Director, High Performance Director, Executive Director), provided information on the structural design of 36 NSOs and thus, supplied a rich source of real time data for the analysis of change in these organizations.

Operational Procedures

The first objective of this chapter, then, will be to identify the structural designs for the starting point (1984), the implementation period (1986), and the end point (1988) of the change period for this set of NSOs. Having established the structural designs for these organizations, what will emerge from this empirical analysis is how far organizations are within the three proposed design archetypes (Kitchen Table, Boardroom, and Executive Office) and how far they are distributed away from them over time. It is important to outline here how each of the three design archetypes will be operationally recognized.

The aim was to identify those attributes that are crucial to organizational design coherence for each design archetype. The dimensions of organizational design deal with: specialization, which refers to the extent to which roles are differentiated according to a particular task or purpose; standardization, which refers to the existence of rules and regulations which guide the operations of organizations; and decision making, which refers to the level at which decisions are made and the degree of involvement in decision making. These dimensions of organizational structure have been operationalized by numerous researchers investigating amateur sport organizations (cf. Frisby, 1986; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Kikulis, Slack, Hinings,

& Zimmermann, 1989; Slack & Hinings, 1987). Table III-1 lists the 12 dimensions of organizational structure, specific to NSOs, developed and assessed by Hinings and Slack (1987) and Slack and Hinings (1987) and used in this analysis. Developed to assist the analysis of change in NSOs, the design archetypes uncovered in Chapter II were operationalized according to these NSO specific structural dimensions. Multi-item structural scales were developed for each dimension. Table III-2 lists the items and reliability coefficients established for the scales in time period one (1984). Since stability of the measures over time were not expected, estimates of reliability were restricted to the starting point of the change period. Kimberly (1976) has cautioned against the use of traditional measures of test-retest reliability measures for longitudinal studies on organizational phenomena. This is particularly important when the nature of the problem being examined is organizational change. In this study, the implementation of the QPP required substantial structural changes in NSOs throughout 1984-1988, therefore, it is probable that some scaled items would reflect this change more than others and thus yield "unreliable" measures. The position taken here is that the primary interest is in organizational change. The concern, therefore, is in the change in organizational dimensions from the starting point of data collection (1984) to the end point (1988) and what the degree and direction of this change has been. Profiles of the structural dimensions were established for each of the design archetypes (see Table III-1). These constant empirical referents provided baseline measures for the empirical evaluation of the structural designs and patterns of change for NSOs presented in this chapter. As McKinney (1966) states,

> the relations between elements (criteria) of the [design arche]type are postulated relations; therefore they may legitimately be held constant ... The criteria are purposively selected on the basis of empirical evidence, and put into a pattern that the researcher hopes will serve as a significant base of comparison (p. 13).

A comparison of the extent to which NSOs meet the design archetype profiles serves as the basis for explaining the variety in organizational design and patterns of change. In order for NSOs to be considered archetypical they had to be representative of a design archetype on at least 9 of 12 dimensions, 75-100 percent of an archetype's attributes.

Table III-1
Profiles of Structural Design Attributes for Design Archetypes

	Kitchen Table	Boardroom	Executive Office
SPECIALIZATION			
1. Professional Staff (Proper): the number of professional roles in an organization.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
2. Support Staff (Supper): the number of paid support staff roles in existence.	LOW	LOW/MEDIUM	HIGH
3. Volunteer Roles (Spvol): the number of different roles for volunteers.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
4. Number of Committees (Numco): the number of different committee functions.	LOW	HIGH	LOW/MEDIUM
STANDARDIZATION			
5. Administration (Stadmin): the degree of job specification, policies and procedures that guide roles and tasks.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
6. Athlete Services (Stath): the degree to which high performance programs are in place.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
7. Athlete Support Systems (Stsupp): the extent to which services are inplace to assist the development of high performance programs.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
8. Decision Making (Stdec): the extent to which decisions specific to high performance programs are formalized.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
9. Evaluations (Steval): the extent to which methods of assessment for programs and personnel are formalized.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	HIGH
DECISION MAKING			
10. Locus of Decisions (Locus): the level at which decisions are made.	HIGH	HIGH	LOW/MEDIUM
11. Involvement (Involve): the extent to which various levels in the hierarchy are involved in decision making.	LOW	MEDIUM/HIGH	LOW
12. Concentration (Concen): the extent to which decision making is concentrated in the hands of volunteers.	HIGH	MEDIUM/HIGH	LOW

Table III-2
Reliability Coefficients for Structural Design Scales

	Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient
1. Professional Staff (Proper): Business Administrator, National Coach, Women's Head Coach, Men's Head Coach, Program Coordinator, High Performance Sport Centre Coordinator, Directors for: Managing, Executive, National Team, Technical, Domestic Sport, Marketing, Athlete Programs	13	.6997
2. Support Staff (Supper): Assistant Coach, Trainer, Masseur, Technician, Medical Doctor, Physiologist, Biomechanist, Psychologist, Executive Secretary, Graphic Artist	10	.7659
3. Volunteer Roles (Spvol): President, Past President, Secretary, Athletes Representative, Team Manager, Vice Presidents for: National Team, Finance, Marketing, Domestic Sport, Technical, Geographical, Coaching, Officiating, Administration, Junior Development	15	.4943
4. Number of Committees (Numco): Total Number of Committees	1	N/A
5. Administration (Stadmin): Work plans, Policies and procedures manual, Terms of reference for committees, Communication procedures, Job descriptions for: Professional staff and Volunteers	6	.7351
6. Athlete Services (Stath): Performance criteria, Physiological monitoring, Psychological monitoring, Personal performance files, Talent identification, Athlete agreements, Competition schedule, Athlete training programs, Athlete contact with coach, Training camp plan	10	.7014
7. Athlete Support Systems (Stsupp): Coaching certification program, Use of Coaching Association of Canada, Coaches meetings, Elite coach development, Officiating development, Medical support program, Research program	7	.7497
8. Decision Making (Stdec): Selection of: National athletes, Athletes for carding, National team coaches, National training program; Coaching development, Officiating development	6	.6986
9. Evaluations (Steval): National coach, Professional staff, Programs, Officials	4	.6647
10. Locus of Decisions (Locus): Selection of: National team athletes, Athletes for carding, National team coaches, Training program; Coaching development, Officiating development	6	.7904
11. Involvement (Involve): Selection of: National team athletes, Athletes for carding, National team coaches, Training program; Coaching development, Officiating development	6	.6382
12. Concentration (Concen): Decisions finalized by volunteers, Decisions with volunteer involvement	2	.8729

The method used to enable comparisons across dimensions and across time periods was that of "z-scores". First, the mean scores for each dimension in time period one (1984) were standardized to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 15. This baseline measure was then use to standardized the scores for the 12 dimensions for each NSO for each time period (1984, 1986, 1988). The second step for operationalizing the design archetypes in this study involved the development of upper and lower boundaries for each dimension. Miller and Friesen (1984) argue that measures of variation (e.g., standard deviations) are extremely useful for identifying the critical attributes of configurations. In light of this argument, the boundaries were based on plus or minus one half a standard deviation from the standardized mean of 50 for each dimension. One half a standard deviation was selected as the most appropriate cut off point because a standard deviation greater than one half would have resulted in a large middle range including most scores, while a standard deviation less than one half would have created a narrow middle range with most scores falling in the high or low extremes. Scores were high if they were one half a standard deviation above the mean of 50. That is, NSOs with scores > 57.5 on any dimension were labelled high for that particular dimension. Scores were low if they were one half a standard deviation below the mean of 50. That is, NSOs with scores < 42.5 on any dimension were labelled low for that particular dimension. Scores were medium if they were between plus or minus one half a standard deviation of the mean of 50. That is, NSOs with scores ≥ 42.5 and ≤ 57.5 on any dimension were labelled medium for that particular dimension. By establishing an upper and lower cutoff mean as a basis for determining what each organization's score should be to be described as high, medium, or low on each dimension, distinguishable profiles were obtained for each organization.

From here, it was a matter of assessing how many attributes of each design archetype an organization demonstrated according to the profiles of structural design attributes in Table III-1. The principle guide was each organization's score on each of the 12 dimensions. It was the composite profile of scores and how they interrelated that identified the extent to which each NSO approximated the theoretically derived design archetype profiles in Table III-1. Analysis did involve an element of subjectivity where the researcher's knowledge or intuition about what was most representative of each organization was considered. Overall, it was an iterative process of

assessing each dimension and its relations with other dimensions for each of the 36 NSOs until a level of familiarity with each case was obtained which enabled a confident assessment of the organization according to its degree of deviation from the design archetype profiles.

Appendix 1 lists the number of design elements representative of each design archetype for each NSO. For each of the three time periods, NSOs were labelled archetypical, approximate, or indeterminate. An organization that displayed between 9 to 12 dimensions of either of the archetype profiles, was considered to have full archetypical status. An organization that displayed 7 to 8 dimensions of either of the profiles was considered to have "approximate" archetypical status. Finally, organizations that displayed 6 or fewer archetypical attributes was considered to have "indeterminate" status.

To assess the fit between the obtained data and the design archetypes most relevant for NSOs, the frequency of full archetypical occurrence across the 4 year time period was established for this set of NSOs. There were 2 cases of the Kitchen Table, 18 cases of the Boardroom, and 12 cases of the Executive Office. Using the theoretical profiles in Table III-1 as external validity criterion, the numerical solutions may be compared. Table III-3 shows the means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variation of the structural attributes for NSOs displaying archetypical status. Most elements fit the predicted patterns and those that differed were only marginally out of alignment. Although few occurrences of archetypical status were found throughout the QPP period, the fit with the theoretical profiles and the small variability within the obtained design archetype profiles (see Table III-1 & III-3), lends support for the claim that indeed the design archetypes uncovered for NSOs are useful for ordering the complexity of organizational design and understanding the patterns of change.

Each organization's pattern of change was determined according the shifts in design between the starting point (1984) and the implementation period (1986); and the implementation period and the end point (1988). The comparisons also included a relative assessment of NSO designs to the design archetypes to determine the direction of change throughout the QPP. This method of scoring and longitudinal analysis enabled the deviation from design archetypes to be assessed for each organization independently. It also provided a detailed picture of the patterns of structural change by comparing each NSO's position across the three distinct time periods (1984, 1986, 1988).

Table III-3
Means, Standard Deviations, and Coefficients of Variation of Structural Design Attributes for National Sport Organizations Displaying Full Archetypical Occurrence, 1984-1988

		Kitchen Table N=2	Boardroom N=18	Executive Office N=12
SPECIALIZATION				
Professional Staff	Mean	24.84	50.16	76.64
	S.D.	4.19	8.75	10.14
	C.V.	.17	.17	.13
Support Staff	Mean	37.20	50.54	73.98
	S.D.	4.59	9.24	14.86
	C.V.	.67	.17	.20
Volunteer Roles	Mean	20.19	54.97	56.92
	S.D.	13.55	9.42	12.52
	C.V.	.67	.17	.22
Number of Committees	Mean	26.74	56.90	56.90
	S.D.	0.00	15.04	8.86
	C.V.	0.00	.26	.16
STANDARDIZATION				
Administration	Mean	25.27	62.28	77.25
	S.D.	4.28	6.93	16.42
	C.V.	.17	.11	.21
Athlete Services	Mean	31.10	58.10	86.00
	S.D.	4.28	6.93	16.42
	C.V.	.37	.13	.35
Athlete Support Systems	Mean	24.11	55.18	83.90
	S.D.	0.00	11.00	10.90
	C.V.	0.00	.20	.13
Decision Making	Mean	25.54	57.53	65.88
	S.D.	2.95	9.41	13.65
	C.V.	.12	.16	.21
Evaluations	Mean	29.18	60.56	74.44
	S.D.	7.68	7.58	13.37
	C.V.	.26	.13	.18
DECISION MAKING				
Locus	Mean	65.39	55.47	45.23
	S.D.	39.98	12.98	8.38
	C.V.	.61	.23	.19
Involvement	Mean	44.81	55.79	44.21
	S.D.	5.09	7.75	20.96
	C.V.	.11	.14	.47
Concentration	Mean	56.00	58.52	34.69
	S.D.	16.07	7.85	12.15
	C.V.	.29	.13	.35

Results

In many respects, the frequency distributions shown in Table III-4 support previous claims that NSOs are becoming more professional and bureaucratic. The results indicate substantial organizational design changes in the first 2 years of implementation followed by a gradual change in the last 2 years of the change period. By 1986, the mid-point of the change period, the Kitchen Table archetype disappeared for this population of NSOs. The programs and services these organizations implemented during these first 2 years required a shift in structural design toward either the Boardroom or the Executive Office design archetype. Thus, the Kitchen Table was no longer seen as an appropriate design for NSOs to effectively implement their programs and services. During the 4 years of the QPP, NSOs adopted more professional staff, more formalized operating procedures, and in particular, more sophisticated high performance sport programs. Despite these global findings, it is the variety in organizational design and the patterns of change which are most interesting.

Proposition 1 stated that there would be a variety of structural designs for this population of NSOs at the starting point of the change period. This variety is summarized in Table III-4. Nine different designs were identified during 1984. NSOs ranged from a Kitchen Table design archetype to an Executive Office design archetype. In essence, the variety in organizational design shows that prior to QPP implementation (1984) there was little pressure to adopt a particular design. It is interesting to note, however, that out of the 12 NSOs with archetypical status in 1984, eight had Boardroom status, while another eight were "approximate" to the Boardroom. That is, 44.4 percent (the largest group) of the population were very closely aligned with this archetype prior to the implementation of the QPP.

Although there was no explicit government directive pressuring NSOs to adopt this archetype prior to the QPP, the institutional environment of these organizations did favour those that demonstrated the administrative efficiency of a Boardroom (Regan, 1981; Task Force Report, 1969). These organizations are characterized by specialized roles for staff and volunteers; and an extensive committee structure coordinated by policies and procedures. At the core of these organizations is a volunteer hierarchy where decisions are finalized by the volunteer board after involvement of various committees and hierarchical levels. The results in Table III-4 support the claim made in

Proposition 1, that prior to QPP implementation, NSOs displayed a variety of designs.

Table III-4
Frequency Distribution of Organizational Designs for National Sport Organizations, 1984-1988

	1984		1986		1988	
	No. of NSOs	%	No. of NSOs	%	No. of NSOs	%
EXECUTIVE OFFICE	2	5.6	5	13.9	5	13.9
Approximate Executive Office	2	5.6	2	5.6	6	16.7
Indeterminate Executive Office	2	5.6	4	11.1	12	33.3
BOARDROOM	8	22.2	7	19.4	3	8.3
Approximate Boardroom	8	22.2	15	41.7	10	27.8
Indeterminate Boardroom	7	19.4	3	8.3		
Indeterminate Kitchen Table	3	8.3				
Approximate Kitchen Table	2	5.6				
KITCHEN TABLE	2	5.6				

Recognizing the pressures to change during the QPP, Proposition 2 stated that during the implementation period (1986) and by the end of the QPP (1988), NSOs would move toward either a Boardroom or an Executive Office design archetype. The QPP itself, designed to ensure the implementation of technical and administrative programs, supported a movement toward the Executive Office design archetype, where organizations are professionally led and supported by volunteers. However, given the time constraints required for the effective implementation (e.g., 4 years), all NSOs may not aspire toward, or achieve Executive Office status. Examining Table III-4, it is clearly

evident that the direction of change has been toward either a Boardroom or Executive Office design archetypes.

It is also evident from Table III-4 that throughout the QPP period, the number of NSOs that reflected an approximate or fully coherent Executive Office archetype almost tripled. An increase of 7 NSOs supports a movement toward the Executive Office. In addition, 12 NSOs or a third of the population of organizations, were somewhere in between the Boardroom and Executive Office archetype by 1988. Although "indeterminate" in their design at the end point of the change period, these organizations made substantial movements toward Executive Office archetype status in most of their organizational design attributes.

Results in Table III-4 indicate that during the first 2 years, there was a movement toward the Boardroom archetype with over 60 percent of the NSOs demonstrating approximate or full Boardroom status, however, the latter 2 years of the change period indicated a different trend with greater movement toward the Executive Office. In effect, the pressure to adopt an Executive Office design archetype during this time period was felt, and responded to by most NSOs. Overall, when examining the change in organizational design, there is support for Proposition 2. It is important to recognize this dual direction of change that was found for NSOs when examining the manner in which these organizations changed during the 1984-1988 period. Understanding these differences may provide information on what characteristics are changed to achieve each particular design archetype.

Proposition 3 stated that throughout the QPP period, NSOs would exhibit a variety of patterns of change. Patterns of change were identified for each NSO according to the changes over the three time periods (1984, 1986, 1988) in the number of the 12 structural design attributes characterized as Kitchen Table, Boardroom, or Executive Office, the magnitude of the changes, and the direction of the changes (see Appendix 1). Table III-5 shows the frequency distribution of organizational designs for each pattern of change. For each pattern of change, Tables III-6, III-7, and III-8 using a two period model (1984-1986 & 1986-1988), show the changes in structural design dimensions (Table III-6) and attributes (Tables III-7 & III-8) respectively. It is interesting to note that all NSOs reacted immediately by making the greatest change in standardization attributes during the first 2 years of the QPP. This is not

Table III-5
Distribution of Organizational Designs for National Sport Organizations According to Patterns of Change, 1984-1988

Organizational Design, 1984	No. of Organizations	Pattern of Change
EXECUTIVE OFFICE	2	INERTIA
BOARDROOM	1	"
Approximate Executive Office	2	CONVERGENCE
Indeterminate Executive Office	2	"
Indeterminate Boardroom	6	"
BOARDROOM	5	REORIENTATION
Approximate Boardroom	2	"
Approximate Kitchen Table	1	"
BOARDROOM	1	REVERSAL
Approximate Boardroom	1	"
Indeterminate Kitchen Table	1	"
BOARDROOM	1	UNRESOLVED
Approximate Boardroom	5	"
Indeterminate Boardroom	1	"
Indeterminate Kitchen Table	2	"
Approximate Kitchen Table	1	"
KITCHEN TABLE	2	"
TOTAL	36	

Table III-6
Average Change in Standard Scores of Structural Design Dimensions by Time Period

Pattern	N	1984-1986 Specialization	1984-1986 Standardization	1984-1986 Decision Making	1986-1988 Specialization	1986-1988 Standardization	1986-1988 Decision Making
INERTIA							
Executive Office	2	-1.74	9.08	3.70	6.65	3.73	2.64
Boardroom	1	7.54	9.54	9.94	4.73	0.08	———
CONVERGENCE							
Executive Office	4	5.23	10.97	0.84	3.14	10.69	1.50
Boardroom	6	2.53	11.49	8.77	2.06	1.91	-2.33
REORIENTATION							
Executive Office	7	5.36	16.84	-4.79	2.44	4.41	-0.12
Boardroom	1	13.15	38.27	1.20	-3.04	0.47	0.39
REVERSAL							
Boardroom	3	1.68	14.02	0.87	-3.95	-1.31	2.93
UNRESOLVED							
Executive Office	12	7.64	17.20	-0.99	0.27	8.65	-0.09
TOTAL	36	5.21	15.14	1.26	1.34	4.95	-0.08

Table III-7
Change in Standard Scores of Structural Design Attributes According to Direction and Pattern of Change, 1984-1986

Pattern	N	Proper	Supper	Spvol	Numco	Stadmin	Stath	Stsupp	Stdec	Steval	Locus	Involve	Concen
INERTIA													
Exeuctive Office	2	8.88	———	-12.78	-3.07	12.11	24.31	5.65	-2.09	5.43	6.79	-7.20	11.37
Boardroom	1	———	———	-12.78	42.95	6.06	-5.40	16.95	8.35	21.72	22.62	7.19	———
CONVERGENCE													
Executive Office	4	1.48	4.87	———	14.57	4.54	16.20	9.89	5.22	19.01	-0.57	4.50	-1.42
Boardroom	6	6.91	1.08	2.13	———	10.09	16.20	9.42	9.04	12.67	8.29	11.39	6.63
REORIENTATION													
Executive Office	7	12.69	8.34	-0.91	1.31	9.51	24.69	24.21	7.16	18.62	-5.49	-8.22	-6.49
Boardroom	1	23.68	19.47	6.39	3.07	30.28	43.21	45.20	29.21	43.45	———	3.60	———
REVERSAL													
Boardroom	3	3.95	8.65	6.39	-12.27	18.17	12.60	13.18	15.30	10.86	-3.77	-1.20	7.58
UNRESOLVED													
Executive Office	12	10.36	3.79	7.99	8.44	18.17	24.30	15.07	12.17	16.29	-4.52	0.60	0.95
TOTAL	36	8.72	4.87	2.48	4.77	13.29	20.85	15.54	9.74	16.29	-0.82	0.80	3.79

Table III-8
Change in Standard Scores for Design Attributes According to Direction and Pattern of Change, 1986-1988

Pattern	N	Proper	Supper	Spvol	Numco	Stadmin	Stath	Stsupp	Stdec	Steval	Locus	Involve	Concen
INERTIA													
Exeuctive Office	2	2.96	6.49	6.39	10.74	———	8.10	8.48	2.09	———	7.92	———	———
Boardroom	1	5.92	12.98	———	———	6.06	———	-5.65	———	———	———	———	———
CONVERGENCE													
Executive Office	4	2.96	8.11	-1.60	3.07	12.11	14.85	12.71	8.35	5.43	———	4.50	———
Boardroom	6	1.97	6.49	-5.32	5.11	5.05	1.80	1.88	———	1.81	-1.51	-3.60	-1.90
REORIENTATION													
Executive Office	7	-8.46	2.78	9.13	-1.31	6.92	3.09	6.46	7.15	-1.55	———	-3.60	3.25
Boardroom	1	-5.92	-6.49	6.39	-6.14	6.06	5.40	-11.30	8.35	-10.86	-4.52	———	5.68
REVERSAL													
Boardroom	3	-1.97	-2.16	-10.65	-1.02	2.02	-7.20	———	-1.39	———	-1.51	8.39	1.89
UNRESOLVED													
Executive Office	12	2.96	8.11	-7.45	-2.56	14.13	10.33	9.89	3.48	5.43	-6.41	12.29	-6.16
TOTAL	36	1.48	5.59	-2.13	0.43	8.58	4.05	6.28	3.71	2.11	-2.20	4.80	-2.05

surprising given the pressures to change were focused on increasing technical and administrative systems for high performance sport programs and services. Taking a closer look at the changes in organizational design, Tables III-7 and III-8 show that substantial technical changes in athletes programs and support services to athletes were made in the first 2 years and followed by administrative changes in staff, formalization, evaluation, and so on, in the latter 2 years of the QPP period. It is important here to highlight how the patterns of change differ for a set of organizations experiencing similar pressures for change; and in what manner organizations within a pattern are moving towards different end points.

Three NSOs revealed an ***inertia*** pattern. Two NSOs remained within the prescribed design archetype for the entire time frame and one NSO remained within the Boardroom design archetype. Executive Office organizations following an inertia pattern displayed incremental adjustments in a few design attributes throughout the QPP. By contrast, the one NSO that maintained a Boardroom design archetype, made incremental changes across most attributes during the first 2 years of the QPP but focused changes on specialization during the latter 2 years (see Tables III-6, III-7, & III-8).

In effect, these organizations continued to elaborate their structures and systems according to the design they reflected at the start of the change period. They exhibited what Miller and Friesen (1984) call "momentum" by making incremental adjustments or "fine-tuning" their existing organizational arrangement. For the NSO that maintained Boardroom status, the pressure to move to an Executive Office was resisted. By contrast, those organizations that displayed Executive Office status were aligned with external pressures at the start of the change period and thus elaborated their attributes in the direction of the prescribed design archetype during the entire change period.

Incremental changes were made by 10 NSOs which exhibited a ***convergence*** pattern of change. These organizations followed a constant gradual pattern of change in an effort to move toward the design archetype they were closest to at the start of the change period. Those moving toward the Executive Office made incremental changes across most attributes during the 4 years. Two NSOs that had approximate Executive Office status at the start of the QPP, achieved full Executive Office coherence within the first 2 years and continued to progress in this direction during the latter 2 years of the QPP. Two additional NSOs with an indeterminate Executive Office in

1984 converged toward the Executive Office during the entire 4 years and achieved approximate Executive Office status by 1988. Those NSOs moving toward the Boardroom made changes in standardization and decision making attributes during 1984-1986 and made greater changes in specialization during 1986-1988. These six NSOs resisted pressures to move toward the Executive Office design archetype and converged toward achieving full or approximate Boardroom status by the end of the QPP.

Eight NSOs or 22.2 percent of the population under investigation, exhibited a ***reorientation*** pattern of change. That is, they moved between archetypes during the QPP period. All of these organizations had to break away from the design coherence they held in 1984 and reestablish a new design coherence by 1988. NSOs which displayed a reorientation pattern made substantial changes in all areas of their organizational design. The response of NSOs making a reorientation toward the Executive Office was to make substantial changes across most organizational design dimensions during the first 2 years, followed by constant gradual change in the latter 2 years. Essentially, these seven NSOs moved as far as they could toward the prescribed design archetype during the initial period of QPP implementation and spent the latter period "fine-tuning" their organizational design. One NSO that approximated a Kitchen Table design archetype in 1984 achieved Boardroom status by 1986 and remained in this design archetype for the latter 2 years of the change period.

Another interesting finding emerges when taking a closer look at organizations following the reorientation pattern (see Table III-9). Five NSOs were found to have what Hinings and Greenwood (1988) identified as a "linear" reorientation to a new design archetype. These organizations made substantial changes toward a new design in the first 2 years of the QPP and continued to move in this direction in the latter 2 years. By contrast, three organizations displayed a pattern similar to Hinings and Greenwood's (1988) "delayed" reorientation. These organizations tended to stay in the same position for 2 of the 4 years. In essence, they made an abrupt reorientation in 2 years.

Three NSOs demonstrated a ***reversal*** pattern of change. Two of these organizations had Boardroom status by 1986 (one of which entered the change period within the Boardroom archetype) but could not maintain design coherence for the latter 2 years. One of these organizations lost professional

staff while the other reduced the degree of formalized athletes systems during the 1986-1988 period. A third NSO moved from an approximate Boardroom in 1984 to an approximate Executive Office in 1986, however, by 1988 this organization had reduced the number of support staff and increased the levels involved in decision making to return to the design it held in 1984. In effect, these NSOs made incremental increases in most design attributes during the first 2 years but reversed their position on a few of these structural attributes. Miller and Friesen (1984) call such changes "piecemeal" in that design elements are treated independently as though changes in one attribute do not influence other attributes. The reversal pattern of change that these NSOs demonstrated is a reflection of the uncertainty in direction that these organizations may exhibit during periods of change.

Table III-9
Linearity of Change for the Reorientation Pattern

	Organizational Design			
	1984	1986	1988	
NSO				
Biathlon*	Approximate Kitchen Table	BOARDROOM	BOARDROOM	Linear
Swimming*	Approximate Boardroom	EXECUTIVE OFFICE	EXECUTIVE OFFICE	Linear
Synchronized Swimming	BOARDROOM	Indeterminate Executive Office	Approximate Executive Office	Linear
Table Tennis	BOARDROOM	Approximate Executive Office	Approximate Executive Office	Linear
Figure Skating	BOARDROOM	Indeterminate Executive Office	Approximate Executive Office	Linear
Diving	BOARDROOM	BOARDROOM	Approximate Boardroom	Delayed
Cross Country Ski	Approximate Boardroom	Approximate Boardroom	Approximate Executive Office	Delayed
Women's Basketball	BOARDROOM	Approximate Boardroom	Approximate Boardroom	Delayed

* NSOs that made complete reorientations

Finally, 12 NSOs displayed an ***unresolved*** pattern of change toward the Executive Office. These NSOs made abrupt changes throughout the entire QPP period. Although these organizations made continuous large scale changes toward an Executive Office design archetype during the 4 years, they were unable to achieve design coherence and reflected an "indeterminate" organizational design at the end of the change period. These NSOs have at least 75 percent of their design attributes distributed between the Boardroom and Executive Office archetypes, as a result, they require more time to decide on an appropriate design and achieve archetypical coherence.

The preceding results lend support for Proposition 3 by portraying the variety in both the direction and the patterns of change for NSOs during the QPP. These results do not refute the argument that NSOs have moved toward a more professional and bureaucratic form. The trend has continued and the QPP may have quickened up the pace. The outcome for all NSOs was a substantial increase in the specialization and standardization of administrative and technical structuring. The form of these changes, however, is quite diverse and tends to support the expectation that organizations moving between design archetypes require rapid whole scale changes in their structures and systems (e.g., reorientations). By contrast, organizations may make incremental adjustments in their operations and systems to maintain or achieve coherence (e.g., inertia, convergence, reversal). In addition, substantial change does not ensure a complete reorientation in a prescribed period of change (e.g., reversal, unresolved).

This analysis has considered two significant issues: the extent to which there is variety in organizational design and the extent to which there is variety in the patterns of change. An important component of organizational design change, high impact systems, has not yet been addressed. The contention here is that high impact systems are tightly coupled to the values of organizational members and thus have major implications for understanding transformations to new organizational designs.

Tables III-5, III-6, III-7, and III-8 have all shown that reorientations have distinct differences from the other patterns of change. In particular, these organizations show greater change in the early period (1984-1986) followed by gradual change in the latter period (1986-1988). Also, these organizations made substantial changes across all structural design dimensions. These findings support Hinings and Greenwood's (1988) claim that movement to

new designs requires whole scale changes early in the time period. Of particular importance for this study, is the idea that archetypical change requires a change in high impact systems. Proposition 4 stated that organizations undergoing archetypical change would show the greatest change in their high impact systems.

For NSOs, decision making has been established as a high impact system. In this study, decision making was assessed according to the locus of decision making, the number of hierarchical levels involved in decision making, and the concentration of decision making with volunteers. Particular attention is given to those organizations that made reorientations during the 1984-1988 period in an effort to achieve a new coherent organizational design. Tables III-7 and III-8 show that for the total population of organizations, decisions tended to be decentralized to professional staff, however, organizations were inclined to increase the levels of involvement and maintain the concentration of decision making with volunteers. This implies that delegating decisions to professional staff for example, may not go hand in hand with professional autonomy to make these decisions.

NSOs following the reorientation pattern made archetypical changes toward either the Boardroom or the Executive Office thus, it is important to distinguish these two directions when examining the role of the high impact system of decision making. In addition, organizations following this pattern may also be distinguished according to the degree of archetypical status achieved by the end of the QPP period. Specifically, only two NSOs following the reorientation pattern actually achieved "complete" coherence of a new design archetype by 1988. The remaining six NSOs achieved approximate Executive Office status (see Table III-9).

Table III-10 shows the change scores in the high impact attributes for NSOs which achieved approximate Executive Office status by 1988 and those two NSOs that achieved complete reorientations. The organizational response of the reorientation to the Boardroom was to make initial increases in the involvement in decision making while displaying no change in the locus of decision making nor the concentration of decision making with volunteers. In the latter 2 years, there was a move to decentralize the locus of decision making together with increased concentration of decision making with volunteers. By contrast, the NSO that moved from a Boardroom to an Executive Office archetype made considerable changes in the locus of decision

making and the involvement in the decision making process during the initial stage of the QPP period. This was followed by no change in any of the high impact system attributes during the latter stage of the QPP. Those NSOs that did not quite achieve the Executive Office made changes in the required direction but not to the same degree as the complete reorientation.

Overall, there was considerably more change in the high impact system of decision making for "complete" reorientations to the Executive Office archetype. The abrupt changes reported in the high impact system of the Executive Office reorientation was that which was expected for organizations that move toward new design archetypes. The change in the high impact system of the Boardroom reorientation, however, was not substantial.

Table III-10
Change in the High Impact System of Decision Making for Reorientations

		1984-1986			1986-1988		
Design in 1988	N	Locus	Involve	Concen	Locus	Involve	Concen
Approximate Executive Office	6	-7.62	-3.00	6.63	——	-4.20	——
Boardroom	1	——	3.60	——	-4.52	——	5.68
Executive Office	1	-33.93	-39.56	5.68	——	——	——
POPULATION	36	-0.82	0.80	3.79	-2.20	4.80	-2.05

The results presented here suggest that volunteer controlled decision making, established in a Kitchen Table archetype, is maintained and elaborated within the Boardroom. Consequently, such a reorientation involves greater changes in the specialization and standardization structural design attributes together with the assurance of volunteer involvement in decision making. By contrast, a shift from a Boardroom to an Executive Office requires a fundamental shift in the way decision making is structured. The one NSO that achieved such a reorientation made substantial changes in their decision making structure which signaled a change in core values from volunteer to professional control. In essence, a complete reorientation towards an Executive Office requires a change in the high impact system of

decision making. These findings provide partial support for Proposition 4. A refinement in this proposition is suggested by focusing the importance of decision making as a high impact system for archetypical change toward the Executive Office.

Discussion

The purpose of the empirical study presented in this chapter was to understand the change in the organizational design of NSOs during the QPP period. The QPP was not an explicit plan for structural design change. Nevertheless, as technical and administrative programs and roles increased, there was a definite impact on the organizational design of these NSOs. On a broad scale, the results in this chapter support the claim that the time period of the QPP was "characterized by a genuine movement from Kitchen Table to Board Room" (Task Force Report, 1988, p. 26). As stated in the Task Force Report (1988), there is some evidence to suggest that NSOs have improved their business, managerial, and organizational skills. As defined in this study, for the most part, NSOs involved in the QPP have moved beyond the Boardroom toward the Executive Office.

For most NSOs, however, movement between these two design archetypes will take longer than 4 years. The data reported here provides little evidence that change was an undisturbed linear process. Change was often slow, incomplete, or it involved reversals in direction. Although NSOs experienced pressure to adopt an institutionally prescribed organizational form during the QPP period, the variety in patterns of change exhibited by these organizations were a result of internal organizational forces manifest in the structural arrangements of these organizations.

Only three NSOs maintained archetypical status throughout the entire QPP period. In particular, the only two NSOs with Executive Office status in 1984 maintained this archetype and one of the eight NSOs with Boardroom status in 1984 maintained this archetype. Also important is the finding that the Kitchen Table archetype lost its legitimacy for this set of organizations. For this archetype, external pressures to implement the QPP together with internal forces to make changes as more high performance sport programs and services were implemented, demanded an alternate design. With the implicit pressure to "professionalize" during the QPP (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Task Force Report, 1988), those NSOs with

Executive Office status were within the institutionally prescribed design archetype. They were in balance with their situational context (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988). Resisting this pressure to "professionalize" it may be argued that the NSO that maintained Boardroom status had established internal forces for stability. As Miller (1987) states, "mutually reinforcing elements of structure and politics [i.e., values and interests] breed conformity and rigidity" (p. 691). These results support previous arguments that it is the fit with both external or institutional pressures and/or internal factors that maintains archetypical coherence (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Miller & Friesen, 1984).

It was also found that NSOs have not made the same magnitude of change to their decision making structures as they have to other structural dimensions. Since decision making is traditionally a volunteer controlled element in these organizations, there is opposition to full professional autonomy. Specifically, changes have been limited to the decentralization of the locus of decision making authority. Any attempt to change organizations requires an identification and understanding of those elements that promote stability and thus are forces for resistance to change (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Kanter, 1983). If the decision making structure is the critical design element for complete reorientation, then, understanding the stability of decision making structures over time will clarify the issues associated with organizational change. There is a strong commitment to volunteer led decision making as the legitimate way to organize the authority structure in NSOs. Nevertheless, the delegation of decision making has the potential to initiate further change. As Kanter argues, "even with a strong culture, movements toward decentralization introduce the possibility of change through differing interpretations of the specific organizational meaning of the values" (p. 15). That is, as these NSOs continue to rely on professional expertise reduced involvement and volunteer concentration in the decision making process may emerge.

Further, this chapter points out that in terms of "complete" reorientations toward the Executive Office archetype, a large role in this shift was played by the high impact system of decision making. In essence, the "qualitative" change in decision making structure, required to move from a Boardroom to an Executive Office, seems to be more critical than for movements from a Kitchen Table to a Boardroom. For example, movement

from a Boardroom to an Executive Office requires a shift in control from volunteers to professionals; or as Whitson and Macintosh (1988) suggest, from a broad decision making structure involving a variety of interests to a narrow decision making structure involving expert judgement. Such a "qualitative" change may be resisted because it is counter to the core values underpinning the desired decision making structure in these organizations.

In examining the diffusion and institutionalization of change in the formal structure of civil service, Tolbert and Zucker (1983) found that "civil service procedures were adopted more rapidly by cities when the state mandated them and the process of adoption was directed by a single source" (p. 35). This finding contrasted with the gradual adoption of reforms in cities where there was an absence of state legislation. In essence, prescribed changes are adopted quickly because they are underpinned by externally controlled legislation or resources. In comparison, elements that are not directly involved in prescribed change undergo emergent change.

Kimberly and Quinn (1984) state,

> transitions are generally undermanaged. What tends to be undermanaged is the behavioral rather than the technical side of the process ... Performance in the technical sense can be determined and verified. Investment of time, energy, and thought in issues which are believed to be finite and bounded is attractive (p. 4).

In effect, the distinction is between changes that have technical or concrete referents such as the standardization of rules and programs and the specialization of roles and practices versus less concrete changes focused toward behavioural components such as the authority to make decisions and who should be involved in decisions. Moving from technical to behavioural design elements, the impact of change goes deeper into the core of the organization—requiring a substantial value shift before changes will be visible in the organization's structural design.

For NSOs, this distinction appears when examining those changes that are made quickly and without resistance. Acknowledging the technical basis of the federally initiated and funded QPP, it seems logical to expect that technical changes would be implemented first. The pressure to improve high performance sport outcomes resulted in the quick adoption of technical programs such as performance criteria for athlete selection, training camps, and talent identification programs to name a few. In addition, the introduction of more sophisticated management techniques were

implemented in most NSOs to coordinate this increase in activities. These planned changes were supported by resources and satisfied the general interests of organizational members in providing the best programs and services possible. Thus, the QPP, an externally driven process that emphasized high performance sport development, influenced the initial focus on technical changes during 1984-1988.

By contrast, changes in decision making (which require a change in behaviours that are not easily implemented) were not overtly stated by Sport Canada and thus were not made concrete in the quadrennial plans of NSOs. Thus, the limited change in the high impact system of decision making can be tied to its emergent nature. According to Tolbert and Zucker (1983), if change is left to emerge, the adoption of a new system requires a shift in values and behaviours before this change is adopted. That is, until the "new" way (i.e., Executive Office) of doing things is legitimated as the "right" way of doing things, the adoption of such changes will be slow.

Tushman and Romanelli (1985) and Nadler and Tushman (1989) argue that organizations can undergo "frame-bending" change or "reorientations" of structure, strategy, and process without altering core values and beliefs. These changes

> ... involve a series of rapid and discontinuous change in the organization which fundamentally alters its character and fabric ... Reorientations that also involve discontinuous change in core values which govern decision premises, termed re-creations, represent the most radical form of reorientation (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985, p. 179).

What Tushman and Romanelli (1985) and Nadler and Tushman (1989) call "re-creations" are qualitatively different organizations because they involve "frame-breaking" change in core values. They state these are rare because of the disruption of interactions and behaviours that are reinforced by deeply embedded organizational values and beliefs.

Hinings and Greenwood (1988) and Tushman et al. (1986) have both demonstrated the importance of changing core values or high impact systems for "complete" organizational design change. Specifically, Tushman et al. state, " ... a piecemeal approach to frame-breaking change gets bogged down in politics, individual resistance to change, and organizational inertia" (p. 38). Similarly, Hinings and Greenwood found the critical element for reorientations in their study was the early change in decision making. They state, "such changes symbolize the coming transformation and act to make it

happen ... the high impact system is reconstituted in terms of the targeted values and beliefs and then serves as a reconstituting force on wider design activities" (p. 114).

For NSOs, "frame-breaking" change during the QPP would be change that involved decision making structures. More specifically, the qualitative shift evident in the only NSO that followed a reorientation pattern from a Boardroom to an Executive Office design archetype. Thus, the adoption of the Executive Office is signalled by the change in the high impact system of decision making. This supports the argument that organizations which are involved in transformations have to make whole scale changes in all their structural and systemic elements (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Miller & Friesen, 1984; Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

The results of this study suggest that, during the QPP, most NSOs have experienced "frame-bending" change (cf. Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman et al., 1986; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). That is, they built on their core values for volunteer decision making structures shifting their structural "blueprint" to fit external pressures for change resulting in a fundamentally, yet not a "qualitatively" different structural design. Support for this argument is found in the six NSOs that followed a reorientation pattern toward the Executive Office and ended the time period "approximate" to the Executive Office. These organizations did not make a whole scale shift towards decentralized decision making and reduced involvement in decisions. The "qualitative" shift in the high impact system did not occur for these organizations. In essence, there has not been what Greenwood and Hinings (1988) call a complete "decoupling" of core values from the volunteer led decision making structure characteristic of the Boardroom archetype.

Conclusion

The results of this study support the research on organizational change that argues ongoing evolutionary change is wholly different from change occurring during periods of total reorganization (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). The findings reported here suggest that organizational change involves much more than introducing or prescribing change. It requires breaking down old beliefs and values and building new commitments. This account of organizational

design change in NSOs over the period 1984-1988 supports the view that whole scale changes require an understanding of the core values and high impact systems that anchor an organization.

It is true that the QPP played a significant role in initiating change in NSOs during 1984-1988, however, past organizational designs influence and constrain the choices organizational members make in response to these pressures. Unexpected repercussions (e.g., resistance to change) may occur without a complete understanding of what is involved in strategic change within a sector of organizations. Therefore, managing change requires anticipating support for the status quo (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Kanter, 1983). In particular, further movement of NSOs toward an Executive Office design archetype will take longer because, internally, NSOs support the tradition of volunteer control.

Although decision making has been identified as a central topic in the study of organizational design, it has significant implications for behaviours, actions, and in general, what direction an organization chooses. Changing the decision making structure will thus require a change in the core values or culture of an organization. As Kanter (1983) states, "culture manifests itself through numerous organizational structures; it is made concrete by organizational events. And, thus, it can be managed; it can be shifted by changing concrete aspects of an organization's functioning" (p. 196). It is false, therefore, to treat decision making simply as a measure of structural design. As a critical element of organizational design, the decision making structure enacts the framework that is established by the arrangement of roles, tasks, rules, and procedures. Further research on decision making, therefore, should provide information necessary to understand more fully the nature of strategic change.

Bibliography

Beyer, J.M. (1981). Ideologies, values, and decision making in organizations. In P.C. Nystrom & W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design Vol. 2. Remodelling organizations and their environments (pp. 166-202). New York: Oxford University Press.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. Sociology, 6, 1-22.

Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1982-83). Annual Report. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1983-84). Annual Report. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1986-87). Annual Report. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1990). Issue: High performance management issues, a group discussion. Proceedings of For excellence: A symposium on Canadian high performance sport (pp. 50-51). February 12-14, 1989. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Frisby, W. (1986). The organizational structure and effectiveness of voluntary organizations: The case of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 4, 61-74.

Goldfarb Consultants. (1986, May). The state of the volunteer-professional relationship in amateur sport in Canada. A research report for the Canadian Olympic Association.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization Studies, 9, 293-316.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hinings, C.R., & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of quadrennial plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (p. 127-151). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). The change masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kikulis, L.M., Slack, T., Hinings, C.R., & Zimmermann, A. (1989). A structural taxonomy of amateur sport organizations. Journal of Sport Management, 3, 129-150.

Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class, power, and the Canadian state. In P. J. Galasso (Ed.), Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kimberly, J.R. (1976). Issues in the design of longitudinal organizational research. Sociological Methods & Research, 4, 321-347.

Kimberly, J.R., & Quinn, R.E. (1984). The challenge of transition. In J.R. Kimberly & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), Managing organizational transitions (pp. 1-8). Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.

Macintosh, D., Bedecki, T., & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). Sport and politics in Canada: Federal government involvement since 1961. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McKinney, J.C. (1966). Constructive typology and social theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

Miller, D. (1987). The genesis of configuration. Academy of Management Review, 12, 686-701.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1980). Archetypes of organizational transition. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 268-292.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1984). Organization: A quantum view. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M.L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. The Academy of Management Executive, 3, 194-204.

Powell, W.W., & Friedkin, R. (1987). Organizational change in nonprofit organizations. In W.W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 180-192). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pugliese, D., & Taylor, B. (1977). Sport and the volunteer at the national level. Ottawa: National Sport and Recreation Centre Inc.

Quinn, J.B. (1982). Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin.

Quinn, R.E., & McGrath, M.R. (1985). The transformation of organizational cultures: A competing values perspective. In P. Frost, L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis, C.C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 315-334). Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 1-17.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley & G. Salaman (Eds.), The international yearbook of organizational studies (pp. 197-221). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Regan, G. (1981). A challenge to the nation: Fitness and amateur sport in the 80s. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., & Kikulis, L.M. (1989). The sociological study of sport organizations: Some observations on the situation in Canada. International Review for Sociology of Sport, 24, 179-200.

Slack, T., & Thibault, L. (1988). Values and beliefs: Their role in the structuring of national sport organizations. Arena Review, 12, 140-155.

Starbuck, W.H., Greve, A., & Hedberg, B.L.T. (1978). Responding to crises. Journal of Business Administration, 9, 111-137.

Task Force Report. (1969). Report of the task force on sports for Canadians. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.

Task Force Report. (1988). Toward 2000: The report of the task force on national sport policy. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Tolbert, P.S., & Zucker, L.G., (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 22-39.

Tushman, M.L., Newman, W.H., & Romanelli, E. (1986). Convergence and upheaval: Managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution. California Management Review, 29, 29-44.

Tushman, M.L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 7 (pp. 171-222). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1988). The professionalization of Canadian amateur sport: Questions of power and purpose. Arena Review, 12, 81-96.

CHAPTER IV

High Impact Systems of Change: An Analysis of Decision Making Structures in National Sport Organizations

Researchers have shown a great deal of interest in the changing organizational design of national sport organizations (NSOs) in Canada. Recent arguments have suggested that although these organizations are configured according to external pressures, their structures and systems are also influenced by the values and interests of organizational members (cf. Hinings & Slack, 1987; Slack & Hinings, 1987; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). One of the key issues that has been identified in this literature is changing values about the roles and responsibilities of volunteers and professionals. Essentially, the issue is one of which group has decision making authority (cf. Goldfarb Report, 1986; Greaves, 1976; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Task Force Report, 1988; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1991; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). It has been argued that the traditional volunteer controlled decision making structure of NSOs is no longer sufficient given the new demands for specialized programs and services. In other words, there has been increasing pressure on NSOs to adopt a decision making structure that gives professional staff the authority and autonomy over decisions traditionally made by volunteers.

The desire for increased professional involvement is a result of increased demands on amateur sport organizations to provide more sophisticated and formalized programs and services (cf. Goldfarb Report, 1986; Kidd, 1988; Munro, 1970; Task Force Report, 1969). As stated in the Goldfarb Report (1986), "the understanding and experience of professionals is an important resource for the organization's policy process (as well as in making such decisions as selection of coaches, support personnel and athletes for national and provincial teams)" (p. 3). The increased "professionalization" of NSOs has also been supported in the recently published Task Force Report (1988) which recommends that professional staff have the final decision making authority in areas where volunteers can no longer act efficiently and effectively in isolation.

Central to this argument is the fact that although the formal position of volunteers (as executive members of the board) provides them with the source of decision making authority, they are physically removed from the

central office location of NSOs and thus, are seen as slow to recognize and react to program and policy issues. By contrast, the formal position of professional staff necessitates their location at the head office of NSOs in the Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre (CSFAC). This has given them greater access to information about their organization than that available to volunteer executives.

Writing on board-staff relations, Middleton (1987) points out that the possession of organization specific information and knowledge gives professionals an authoritative voice on many critical policy and program issues resulting in questions about the ability of volunteers to make such decisions. Similarly, Bartenuk and Franzak (1988) suggest that the restructuring of roles also has an impact on the way roles, duties, and reporting relationships are understood. They state " ... changed role expectations may occur through shifts in the context in which individual roles are enacted" (p. 581). In NSOs, the substantial growth in the roles, responsibilities, and programs, over the years, has given professional staff administrative autonomy to manage and coordinate the daily operations of their organization. In essence, the role of professional staff has evolved into one that is critical to decision making and to the management of the direction of NSOs.

In addition to the arguments for a professionally led decision making structure in NSOs, the sport literature has repeatedly suggested that any alteration in this regard is highly contentious (cf. Goldfarb Report, 1986; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Pugliese & Taylor. 1977; Thibault, Slack, & Hinings, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). These studies suggest that a key source of this contention is the traditional culture of amateur sport organizations which supports a volunteer governed decision making structure and makes the widespread adoption of professionally led decision making problematic. The present study addresses this issue by assessing the changes in the "high impact system" of decision making for NSOs involved in the Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP) between 1984 and 1988. During this time frame, many NSOs were facing a qualitative shift in the values that underpin their structural designs. Specifically, a strong emphasis for increased "professionalization" in NSOs was a result of both an external push by Sport Canada, the primary funding agency for these

organizations, and an internal pull by professional staff (and some volunteers) for professional control of decision making.

Chapter III provided evidence that the introduction of the QPP in 1984, gave substantial impetus to such a change by providing the opportunity for professional staff to be involved in more of the important decisions for developing the direction of their organization. This shift in roles (i.e., from operational management to strategic management) was expected to translate into a reformed decision making structure that relies on the expertise of professional staff. As Slack and Hinings (1987) succinctly state, "there may be a shift from an organization controlled by volunteers, assisted by professionals, to one controlled by professionals, assisted by volunteers" (p. 186). This is a pivotal change, outlined in preceding chapters as a reorientation from either a Kitchen Table archetype or a Boardroom archetype to an Executive Office archetype. In trying to understand the change between these archetypes for NSOs, it is important, therefore, to identify what it is about the decision making structure that is tightly coupled to the core values of a volunteer orientation which underpins this set of organizations and is thus, most resistant to change.

This chapter first presents the theoretical arguments for examining the strategic change in decision making structures in NSOs. A particular emphasis is placed on decision making as a high impact system and the conceptualization of decision making structures for these organizations. Following this, the research propositions, designed to explore the role of high impact systems in organizational design change are presented, as well, the methods of analysis are outlined. Finally, the relationship between decision making structures, coherent organizational designs, and patterns of organizational change are analyzed and discussed.

Theoretical Framework

The theme that has been developed in the preceding chapters builds on Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a) argument that design archetypes, which are best described as highly integrated structural elements that are underpinned by certain values, constitute a framework by which to understand change. It has also been suggested that organizations with archetypical coherence find it difficult to make substantial organizational changes (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

According to Greenwood and Hinings, to achieve such change requires a process of decoupling values from structures combined with a subsequent shift toward new values and structures to reestablish design coherence. Basic to this theoretical argument is that some organizational elements are more tightly coupled to the organization's core values and thus change in these elements will have a "high impact" on archetypical coherence (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a).

Taking this perspective a step further, from the results in Chapter III it was contended that it is the close alignment of decision making structures with an organization's core values that contributes to organizational design and strategic change. It is decision making that is tightly coupled to value preferences and thus gives meaning to the organization. Essentially, decision making structures are rooted in specific view points or values and involve different interest groups. For NSOs, archetypical change, (i.e., the process by which old values and structures are supplanted by new ones) depends on relinquishing the traditional values for a volunteer governed decision making structure by those organizational members (i.e., volunteer executives and professional staff) whose values are presently represented in the decision making structures. It is at the level of governance that current organizational values are shaped and replaced. This explains why it is so difficult to change decision making, even if the change seems to be necessary to achieve organizational design coherence (Beyer, 1981; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Quinn & McGrath, 1985).

In light of these arguments, Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a) framework of design archetypes tied to work on decision making is an area of useful integration given the core values that structure decision making and constrain organizational change. A closer look at decision making structures as high impact systems seems fruitful for explaining changes resulting from the need to adapt organizational structures and processes to internal and external pressures for archetypical change.

Decision Making Structures as High Impact Systems

The significance of decision making structures for organizational design may be traced back to contingency arguments where researchers viewed the structural dimensions of specialization (i.e., the differentiation of roles and tasks), standardization (i.e., the extent to which rules and procedures guide

behaviour), and centralization (i.e., the locus of authority to make decisions) as the key elements that are influenced by contextual forces (e.g., size, environment, technology) for change (see Jennergren, 1981 for a review). The underlying theme of this literature is that there is a lack of clearly defined relationships between centralization and the other structural dimensions and contextual variables. Specifically, there is a range of findings from strong or weak positive correlations to strong or weak negative correlations. There have, as Jennergren (1981) suggests, been numerous attempts to rationalize the ambiguity in these findings. The issue here is not to resolve this ambiguity (a task that may be impossible), but to emphasize the need to recognize the complexity of decision making in further research on organizational design change.

Frisby's (1983) research on Canadian amateur sport organizations is consistent with the findings of contingency theorists. In her analysis of the structure of NSOs, Frisby found no significant relationship between the contextual elements of size, dependence, age, and technology with the centralization of decision making. In an explanation of this finding, she claims that it is important to consider not only the hierarchical arrangement of these organizations but also the geographical location of the hierarchical levels. Specifically, the levels of authority in NSOs are dispersed geographically, volunteer board members reside in different provinces while full time professional staff, who have formal positions lower in the hierarchy of authority than volunteer executives, are geographically centralized working out of a national office location near Ottawa. This aspect of NSOs, therefore, may have an important influence on the structure of decision making. That is, decision making centralized at the board level and dispersed geographically may be countered by the centralized geographical location of offices and personnel. In effect, the forces which influence the centralization of decision making are very different from the contextual factors or conditions identified by contingency theorists.

The ambiguity of the role of centralization in contingent relationships highlights the importance of considering the total pattern of interactions among structural dimensions rather than investigating the centralization or decentralization of decision making as a correlate of individual design dimensions (Jennergren, 1981). It is this approach that has been adopted in recent work on organizational change that has emphasized the structural

configuration of organizational activities (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Miller & Friesen, 1984; Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). In addition, it is also stated that what gives this framework meaning are the systems and processes that enact these structural design elements (cf. Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kanter, 1983; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980; Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980). In organizations, decision making structures are important systems of interaction which may be altered as roles and procedures are changed.

While it is true that decision making is in fact an element of organizational design, and thus, reinforces a particular organization's structure, unlike standardization and specialization, decision making represents a dynamic process in organizations (cf. Hickson, Butler, Cray, Mallory, & Wilson, 1986; Langley, 1989, 1990). As Kanter (1983) states,

> out of the design and structure of the organization arises a set of patterns of behavior and cultural expectations that guide what people in the system consider appropriate modes of operating ... such expectations or cultural 'norms' guide the behavior in a holistic sense (p. 178).

That is, the decision making structure in an organization, governs behaviour, determines whose interests matter, and establishes how things should be done. It is these choices and the decisions made early in the development of organizations that have a substantial influence on the range of choices available in later years (cf. Gersick, 1991; Kimberly, 1987; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987). Gersick argues that these early choices made by organizational members establish "deep structures" that give the organization its meaning and that are difficult to change. As a result, decision making is likely to be the critical element in understanding organizational design change because of its strong relationship with the traditional values and understandings that give meaning to the organization.

Cunningham, Slack, and Hinings (1987) make similar arguments for their finding of little change in decision making of amateur sport organizations that experienced substantial increases in the standardization and specialization of roles, rules, and programs. They suggest that the voluntary nature of amateur sport organizations restricts the decentralization of decision making to professionals from the volunteer board. Similarly, in her study of NSOs, Frisby (1983) noted that,

> ... in many cases, the salaried program staff are expected to provide only a support service to the board of directors ... That is, even though the staff must possess a number of qualifications and they work full time on

> association business, there are few areas in which they are given decision making authority (p. 173).

In their longitudinal analysis of the impact of professionalization on the structure of amateur sport organizations, Thibault, Slack, and Hinings (1991) found that, following the initial hiring of professional staff, amateur sport organizations tended to increase the centralization of decision making followed by a gradual decentralization over time. They argue that the historical and cultural ties of volunteer control have had a significant impact on the actions of amateur sport organizations and have shaped the extent to which these organizations have decentralized their decision making to professional staff working in these organizations.

The difficulty in identifying consistent relationships for decision making in amateur sport organizations can be addressed by considering Child's (1972) argument that " ... the underlying connection between these variables [specialization, standardization, and centralization] is seen to be their common role in describing a framework of administrative control" (p. 174). Child's argument is that the structuring of activities through specialization and standardization and the authority to make decisions (i.e., centralization) are alternative administrative control systems rather than correlates of structural design. Thus, organizations have a choice of control strategies: a bureaucratic strategy where rules and procedures enable the delegation of authority to specialized role holders; or a centralizing strategy where decisions are confined to the top level organizational members (Child, 1972, 1973). The choice of control strategies for NSOs is limited by their source of legitimacy, (i.e., volunteer led/centralized decision making structures), established early in the development of NSOs.

Direct government involvement in the early 1970's has been emphasized by researchers as the benchmark for understanding the changes that have occurred in NSOs (cf. Harvey & Proulx, 1988; Kidd, 1988; Macintosh, Bedecki, & Franks, 1987). What is often overlooked in these analyses, however, is the early development of these organizations. Amateur sport organizations in Canada have a long history. They have moved from small associations with local appeal to national organizations with international links. The rise of the "national" sport organization emerged long after the establishment of sports associations at local and regional levels. An important point is that today's NSOs were built around volunteer governed associations (cf. Howell

& Howell, 1985; Schrodt, 1983; Slack, 1985). Although there has been substantial development in these organizations, from the results in Chapter III it was suggested that one aspect that has remained relatively stable is their volunteer led decision making structure.

The stability of decision making must be considered when trying to understand change. The focus of this review has emphasized that decision making is the high impact system for understanding organizational design change in NSOs. The tight coupling of decision making structures to the core values of volunteer control is embedded in the orientation of these volunteer nonprofit organizations. For many NSOs it is inconceivable to pursue an alternative decision making structure. Any attempt to change this aspect of these organizations, therefore, requires " ... understanding the culture/value reorientation between and among staff and volunteers" (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1990, p. 51). For NSOs, volunteer led decision making defines the historically anchored control structure. Such a long tradition of volunteer control is bound to have emotional significance and may hinder the rapid adoption of professionally led decision making for those NSOs moving in this direction.

An important issue is that volunteer board members are the representative body for organizational members. NSOs are led by volunteer members who have been elected to represent their sport at the national level. Specifically, volunteers have the legitimate decision making authority to make policy and strategic decisions. Thus, as volunteer nonprofit organizations, the underpinning source of legitimacy is the value for private ownership or what Baka (1978) calls a "self help" orientation. Although the independence of NSOs, in terms of sources of funding, has been reduced in recent years due to the increasing government funding, their continued volunteer "ownership" has been acknowledged (cf. Government of Canada, 1990). As a result, the decision making structure is likely to have a "high impact" on organizational change because of its strong institutional ties. In understanding change in NSOs, therefore, the role of decision making is a critical one.

The preceding argument suggests that decision making structures react very differently than other design dimensions. There has been little attempt, however, to develop a comprehensive understanding of the importance of decision making in the analysis of organizational design change. What is

proposed here is that the scope of choice for the level of specialization and standardization of roles and rules may be strongly influenced by forces external to the organization, while the scope of choice regarding the extent to which decision making is centralized is influenced more by the traditional processes and values. Decision making is a high impact system that, on the one hand, identifies the core values which gives a design coherence and, on the other hand, must be changed for organizations to undergo whole scale design change (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a).

The Characteristics of Decision Making Structures

The ambiguity of past results with respect to the role of centralization in organizational design together with the argument for considering decision making as the high impact system of change, raises the issue of measurement. The underlying concern is the complexity of the concept of decision making and how to account for this complexity. The discussion of decision making structures presented in Chapter III suggested that organizations that differ in their structural designs will differ in their decision making structure. Decision making, however, exists along two dimensions, the topic of decision and the elements of decision making. An accurate understanding of high impact systems requires a clarification of how these two aspects can be conceptualized and measured.

There is general agreement that the concept of centralization is not an absolute measure but is rather a relative measure of the degree to which decisions are centralized at the top of the hierarchy of authority or decentralized to lower levels (Jennergren, 1981). However, the tendency has been to aggregate and average locus of decision making scores across quite divergent decision topics. In such cases, Greenwood and Hinings (1976) point out that the unique patterns of organizational design are concealed. That is, some decisions may be more centralized than others. To overcome this problem, they suggested researchers recognize the incompatibility of locus of decision scores across decision topics and examine the "types" of decisions when examining centralization as an organizational design dimension.

Hickson et al. (1986) and Langley (1990) have both suggested that it is the structure and the topic for decision which are significant. Specifically, Hickson et al. claim that more often it is the topic of decision that best discriminates the decision making process rather than the organization's

characteristics. In addition, a significant consideration is that some decisions may be more important than others (Jennergren, 1981). In their review of the literature on types of decisions, Dastmalchian and Javidan (1987) concluded that,

> although there seems to be some confusion over what constitutes strategic and operational decisions, there is evidence in the literature which suggests that more important, or strategically oriented, decisions tend to be more centralized than those that are more operational in nature (p. 307).

Further, in their own analysis of the impact of organizational context on centralization in Canadian public organizations, these authors found that strategic decisions were more centralized and less influenced by contextual variables than less strategic decisions. Subsequently, decisions viewed more important to strategic outcomes in organizations may be more tightly coupled to the core values of how decisions should be made.

The important point to make here is that there is a need to examine the high impact system of decision making at a much more detailed level of analysis. This requires moving from what Skivington and Daft (1991) call a "coarse grained approach" where decisions are aggregated to a "fine grained approach" where each decision is considered independently. In light of this, the decision topic is important to consider when determining the archetypical status of NSOs and establishing an indepth understanding of patterns of change.

The second issue, the elements of decision making, have traditionally been understood through measures of formal decision making. More specifically, emphasis has been placed on determining where in the hierarchy decisions are finalized, or the extent of authority held at upper levels (e.g., centralization) versus the extent of authority held at lower levels (e.g., decentralization). The approach taken in this study and advocated by Carter and Cullen (1984), is that it is important to consider multiple measures of decision making. The locus of decision making is just one of four aspects of the decision making structure that has been identified in the literature (cf. Carter & Cullen, 1984; Jennergren, 1981; Langley, 1990). A second measure, the scope of participation or involvement across hierarchical levels provides an additional indication of the extent to which members participate in the decision making process. Decision making in organizations are underpinned by rules (written or unwritten) which establish what members are involved,

how decisions are made, and how decisions are announced. Therefore, a third measure, the degree to which decisions are formalized, must also be considered. Finally, it is important to consider whether decision making is concentrated in the hands of a small number of individuals or dispersed among various groups. In this study, a fourth measure, the concentration of decision making in the hands of volunteers versus professionals is of particular importance.

These multiple dimensions of decision making structures are supported by the work of Carter and Cullen (1984) who state that there are " ... several separate facets of decision making, the assessment of which can provide unique information necessary to explain more fully the nature of organizational decision making" (p. 267). Consequently, there is a substantial case, for a comprehensive analysis of high impact systems in organizational change—in this case decision making structures. In effect, it is the way that these elements of decision making are interrelated that influence the decision making structure of NSOs. The decision making structure, that is, how formalized the decision making process is, where in the hierarchy decisions are finalized, how many levels are involved in the decisions, and how concentrated the decisions are with specific interest groups, is an explicit representation of how the organization ***should*** be governed.

What this discussion suggests is that although decision making is critical to organizational design and strategic change, it is the least understood structural dimension. The challenge of understanding the significance of decision making structures carries with it a promise: that it will enhance our understanding of why some organizations undergo transformations in their organizational design while others make incremental changes within their existing design. This promise is in keeping with Greenwood and Hinings' (1988) and Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a) concept of design archetypes which may be described in terms of structures and systems underpinned by values. Hinings and Greenwood suggest that if organizations are to make successful reorientations then, the decoupling of values from structural arrangements is necessary and those systems that are at the core of the organization's values (e.g., high impact systems) must lead change.

The close association that decision making structures have with the underlying values of organizations supports an argument for a much more detailed level of analysis of decision making structures than the present

literature on structural change provides. Building on the conceptual framework of design archetypes for NSOs developed in Chapter II and the empirical analysis of patterns of change in a set of NSOs presented in Chapter III, this chapter examines decision making structures as the high impact system of change for these organizations in an effort to provide a more comprehensive understanding of archetypical change.

In Chapter III decision making was examined on an aggregate basis to identify the ***relationships*** among organizational design dimensions. Based on these relationships and the proximity to the design archetypes uncovered for NSOs, patterns of change were identified for NSOs over the 1984-1988 period. The interest in this chapter is to understand the ***content*** of decision making structures as a high impact system in organizational design change for a set of organizations experiencing similar pressures for change. The general thesis is that a comprehensive understanding of major organizational design change that involves a shift in the high impact system of decision making, requires isolating the topics and elements that constitute this system.

Development of Propositions

Based on an aggregated analysis of decision making, important issues concerning the decision making structure as it relates to organizational stability and change were raised in Chapter III. With respect to the stability of organizational designs, it was discovered that over the 1984-1988 period, NSOs most representative of the design archetypes (i.e., Kitchen Table, Boardroom, Executive Office) uncovered for these organizations, displayed different decision making structures. In terms of organizational change during the QPP, it was found that for most NSOs, movement between these design archetypes was not characterized by substantial changes in their decision making structures. In particular, change in decision making was restricted to the decentralization of decision making. It is these interpretive problems when moving from an analysis of the stability of organizational design to the dynamics of organizational change that highlight the importance of a more comprehensive analysis of decision making structures as high impact systems of change.

It is not simply the decision making structure that describes the high impact system for archetypical change. Rather, it is the relationship between the decision making structure and the core values of NSOs which has a "high

impact" on the manner in which these organizations change. This is important when considering the context in which this study takes place. The framework advanced in this chapter contends that the stability of volunteer led decision making in NSOs contributes to the "high impact" decision making will have during periods of substantial organizational design change.

Jennergren (1981) states, " ... decision making is delegated only in situations where control over policies and other important matters remains centralized. An implication is that organizations strive to balance between centralization and decentralization" (p. 39). The importance of decision topics (i.e., their strategic importance) is, of course, determined by the interests and values of organizational decision makers. An important addition to the analysis of decision making structures as high impact systems of change, therefore, is the decision topic which may help explain the differences and similarities in decision making structures of design archetypes. The consequences of professionally led decision making structures, therefore, will be felt more strongly with critical decision areas. Thus, the first proposition of this study states:

> ***1. Design archetypes will show the greatest difference in their decision making structures in the "less strategic" decision topics.***

The time frame of the QPP has been described as one where there was a push for professionalization and subsequently, decentralization of decision making. Building on the argument that design archetypes are "qualitatively" different, the critical difference with respect to decision making, between the Kitchen Table and/or Boardroom and the Executive Office was identified in Chapter III. What is required to move to an Executive Office is a change in the decision making structure which is consistent with the new role expectations of professional staff.

Although professional staff have been given the responsibility for many programs and services, volunteers are uncertain about the idea of full professional autonomy over decision making, an area traditionally left to volunteers (cf. Goldfarb Report, 1986; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). In the Executive Office, this uncertainty is resolved through professionally led/volunteer assisted decision making structures. More specifically, volunteers are consulted during the decision making

process but do not finalize decisions. This is supported by the move away from regional representatives on the boards of NSOs toward more specialized volunteer executives who have a particular expertise to contribute to decision areas. When volunteers do not make decisions and are not involved in the decision making process, then decision making is controlled solely by professionals (cf. Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). It is this situation, of full professional autonomy, that is resisted in NSOs, thus it is proposed that:

> 2. ***In the Executive Office archetype the concentration of decision making is professionally led and volunteer assisted.***

It follows that a comprehensive analysis of the elements of prevailing decision making structures is crucial for understanding the patterns of change which occurred in NSOs during the QPP. In Chapter III evidence was provided that supports the argument that organizations experiencing similar pressures for change follow a variety of change patterns. More importantly, the results in Chapter III found that the shift in decision making for reorientations between the Kitchen Table and the Boardroom archetypes was less traumatic. It was suggested that for NSOs, the structure of decision making in the Boardroom builds on the core values for volunteer governance established in the Kitchen Table. In this sense, support was found for Tushman and Romanelli's (1985) and Nadler and Tushman's (1989) model of change where organizations may make substantial changes (in their terms, reorientations) without changing core values (and subsequently, high impact systems).

By contrast, the high impact system of decision making was found to be critical for what has been called "qualitative" or "second order" change by Bartenuk and Franzak (1988), what Tushman and Romanelli (1985) and Nadler and Tushman (1989) call "re-creations", and what is described by Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) as "archetypical" change. More importantly, Hinings and Greenwood found that a distinguishing characteristic of organizations that underwent archetypical change in their study was " ... a particular concern with the pattern and criteria of decision making" (p. 139). This was also found to be the critical difference between the NSO that made a complete reorientation to the Executive Office archetype and the NSO that

made a complete reorientation to the Boardroom archetype (see Chapter III). These findings led to the conclusion that during the QPP, the high impact system of decision making is more critical for reorientations to the Executive Office. It should not be ignored, however, that the 1984-1988 period was one in which NSOs made significant changes in the sophistication of their high performance programs. The implementation of these changes resulted in substantial changes in the bureaucratic structuring of all 36 NSOs involved in the QPP. Specifically, there was a general shift toward the Executive Office.

Child (1972) has argued that bureaucratic structuring (i.e., standardization and specialization) and centralization of the authority to make decisions are alternative control structures. Through the implementation of their quadrennial plans, NSOs made substantial increases in their standardization and specialization of programs, roles, and rules. According to Child, such a change would be accompanied by the delegation of authority or decentralization. The question to be asked then, is not whether change in high impact systems caused this change in organizational design, rather the issue is to understand the content and degree of change in high impact systems according to the various patterns of change that NSOs followed during the QPP. It has been argued that the structure of decision making in design archetypes is influenced by the topic for decision, and that "strategic" decisions will be more tightly coupled to values for volunteer led decision making. Substantial change toward a new design archetype, therefore, would require change across all decision topics (i.e., "less strategic" and "strategic" decisions). In addition, it has also been argued that whole scale change toward the Executive Office requires a shift in the high impact system of decision making. More specifically, a change toward the Executive Office would require a shift away from values for volunteer led decision making. Thus, it is proposed that:

> ***3a. National sport organizations with the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring will make decision making changes either toward the Boardroom or the Executive Office archetype in all decision topics.***

3b. National sport organizations that have made the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring toward the Executive Office archetype will change the concentration of decision making from volunteers to professionals.

The theme developed in Chapter III and elaborated further in this chapter, suggests decision making change is more critical for reorientations toward the Executive Office design archetype than the Boardroom design archetype. Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) found reorientations to include changes in structures, systems, and values. More importantly, they found the high impact system led reorientations. In essence, for these researchers, reorientations are synonymous with archetypical change. The question to be asked then, is what is it about the change in the decision making structure of NSOs that enables a reorientation or "complete" archetypical change? In Chapter III, an aggregate analysis of decision making found that the one NSO that made a complete reorientation to the Executive Office made substantial changes in their high impact system of decision making. Thus, the final proposition for this study is:

4. National sport organizations following a reorientation pattern toward the Executive Office archetype will make decision making changes across all decisions and shift the concentration of decision making toward professional staff.

Methods

Sample and Data Collection

It is important to consider how and under what circumstances change involves high impact systems. Such an exploration can further our understanding of the complexity of NSOs and can ultimately help us understand how they change. With an absence of research on these issues for these organizations, it was felt that an examination of NSOs facing the same institutional pressures for change, would provide a setting to identify similarities and differences in the role of high impact systems in the strategic organizational design change for this set of organizations.

The data selected for this study come from the same population of organizations investigated in Chapter III. As reported in Chapter I, data from a larger research project at the University of Alberta investigating the impact

of the QPP on the change in NSOs, was made available to the author for the purposes of this investigation. Data from the larger project was collected from professional staff who were familiar with the formulation and implementation of the QPP (e.g., Executive Director, Technical Director, High Performance Director). This chapter focuses on information collected on the decision making structures of these organizations at three specific time intervals: 1984, representing the beginning of the QPP change period; 1986, representing the mid-point of the change period; and 1988, representing the end of the change period. Based on the design archetypes and patterns of change identified in Appendix 1, data on the changes in decision making structures were assessed here in an effort to provide specific detail on the role of decision making as a high impact system of organizational design change for these organizations.

Operational Procedures

A comprehensive assessment of decision making structures as a high impact system requires a precise conceptualization and measurement of decision making and decision topics (cf. Carter & Cullen, 1984; Hickson et al., 1986; Langley, 1989, 1990). Hinings and Slack (1987) and Slack and Hinings (1987) have developed a precise operational definition of the concept of decision making structures specifically for NSOs. More importantly, they included multiple measures of decision making structure and multiple decision topics. Thus, the use of their variables was considered appropriate.

The four distinct dimensions of formal decision making structure used in this chapter were:

1. ***Formalization of the decision making process:*** refers to the extent to which written policies and procedures direct and control the decision making process with respect to who is involved in the process, how decisions are to be made, and how decisions are to be announced. The degree of formalization was recorded on a four point scale where 1=A little or no formal procedures; 2=Some formal procedures; 3=Considerable formal procedures; 4=A great deal of formal procedures. The extremes of this scale represent low formalization, or decisions based on opinion or intuition and high formalization, that is, decisions based on sophisticated analysis where judgement is based on more objective criteria.

2. ***Locus of decision making:*** reports the level at which decisions are finalized and thus, determines the extent to which decision making is centralized at the top of the organization or is decentralized to lower hierarchical levels. To assess the locus of decision making, the hierarchical levels applicable to NSOs were scored as: 5=Board of Directors; 4=Executive Committee and Professional Staff; 3=Functional Committees, Vice Presidents and Professional Staff; 2=Professional Staff; 1=Lower level Professional Staff; 0=Outside the organization.

3. ***Involvement in decision making:*** refers to the number of levels involved in the decision process; and provides an indication of the extent to which members participate in the decision process. To assess involvement in decision making, the actual number of different levels that participate in the decision process but do not necessarily make the final decision were reported.

4. ***Concentration of decision making:*** includes two issues: i) the total percentage of decisions finalized by volunteers and ii) the total percentage of decisions volunteers were involved in but did not necessarily finalize. This enabled an assessment of the shifting control of decision making from volunteers to professional staff, an issue of particular importance for understanding the archetypical change in NSOs.

The measures of decision making structure discussed above may not be equivalent across decisions, consequently, it is important to consider specific decision making topics (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1976; Hickson et al., 1986; Langley, 1989, 1990). Given NSOs were experiencing similar pressures for change during the QPP, it was considered important to include decisions that were relevant to this period so comparisons across NSOs could be made. The idea was to include a range of decisions that were relevant to successful QPP implementation. Consequently, the six decisions identified by Slack and Hinings (1987) as being important for NSOs in achieving their planned QPP objectives by 1988 were used in this study:

1. ***Selection of national team members (Athletes)***
2. ***Selection of athletes for carding (Carding)*** (i.e., federal government funding assistance).
3. ***Selection of national team coaches (National Coach)***
4. ***Selection of training programs for national athletes (Training)***
5. ***Coaching development programs (Coaching Development)***
6. ***Officiating development programs (Officiating Development)***

Given the implementation of the QPP was for the purpose of producing elite athletes for a "Best Ever" performance in the 1988 Olympic Games, three decisions may be judged as "strategically" important for the success of this objective: selection of, national team members, carded athletes, and national team coaches. In his comprehensive review on decentralization in organizations, Jennergren (1981) states that financial decisions and decisions regarding personnel are frequently identified as important organizational decisions and consequently, they tend to remain centralized with the top management group. By contrast, decisions regarding selection and development of programs (e.g., national team, coaching, officiating) can be viewed as supporting issues for QPP success. That is, although they enable NSOs to develop high performance programs, their link to performance at the 1988 Olympic Games was indirect. Consequently, these decisions may be considered as "less strategic" and are more likely to be delegated to lower levels (e.g., professional staff). Although the "importance" of decisions was not measured directly, it was felt that the specific decision areas more centrally concerned with high performance sport success will have a "higher impact" on shifting decision making responsibilities between volunteers and professionals than those decisions that are indirectly linked to QPP success.

In Chapter III, arguments were given for expecting a variety of patterns of change. The analysis in Chapter III showed that this variety may be accounted for by an assessment of the shifts in structural design attributes over time. Specifically, based on the association of attributes with the design archetypes over three time periods, patterns of change were assessed for each NSO. Five patterns of change were identified for the population of NSOs involved in the QPP: Inertia (maintenance of design archetype coherence); Convergence (movement towards a design archetype characteristic of a NSO at the beginning of the change period); Reorientation (change to a new design archetype); Reversal (discontinued change toward a new design archetype); Unresolved (change effort fails to achieve the coherence of a new design archetype).

In this chapter, the patterns of change identified in Chapter III were used. The major difference occurred in the analysis of change. As identified in Chapter III, patterns of change represented shifts in structural design or the extent to which relations between design elements made whole scale shifts between 1984 and 1988. As mentioned earlier, the relationship between

structural design elements is complex. For NSOs, this complexity is emphasized when assessing the role of decision making as a high impact system of change.

The argument presented in Chapter III is that decision making structures seem to be more critical for change to the Executive Office design archetype. That is, NSOs that have made the greatest change in specialization and standardization will make the greatest shift in their high impact system of decision making. It is here where Child's (1972) suggestion, that there are alternative strategies of control in organizations, was particularly useful. Specifically, to assess whether patterns of change that showed the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring (e.g., specialization and standardization) also made the greatest change in their high impact system, it was necessary to identify the total degree of change in the dimensions of specialization and standardization for each pattern of change. Thus, eight structural design attributes[1] identified in Chapter III as measures of specialization and standardization for NSOs were used.

Also, the method of analysis established in Chapter III was followed here. First, the 1984 means for each element of decision making (standardization of decision making; locus of decision making; concentration of decision making) and bureaucratic structure were standardized to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 15. This provided a baseline measure to standardize the scores for the eight attributes of bureaucratic structuring and the four attributes of decision making structure for each NSO at the start of the QPP (1984) and at the end of the QPP (1988). Differences in scores were then calculated for eight attributes and summed to obtain a grand total of change in bureaucratic structuring. Each pattern of change was then ranked according to the total change in bureaucratic structuring. Change scores were also determined for each of the decision making attributes (across decision topics), however, to determine the specifics of change in decision making, scores were not summed.

---

[1] The following dimensions of structural design were used as a measure of bureaucratic structuring: Specialization of: professional staff, support staff, volunteer roles, committees; Standardization of: administration, athlete systems, support systems to athletes, and evaluation systems.

Results

Decision Making Structures and Design Archetypes

Building on Hinings and Greenwood's (1988a) argument that "archetypes represent holistic relationships between different aspects of structure, systems and meaning" (p. 23), the first aim of this study was to determine whether the design archetypes found within this population of NSOs displayed unique decision making structures. Based on the classification system established in Chapter III, the frequency of occurrence was determined for the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office archetypes. As reported in Chapter III, the Kitchen Table archetype is characterized by minimal coordination and control, with tasks and policies being designed and carried out by a small core of volunteers. It is important to note that there were only 2 cases of the Kitchen Table archetype. These were found in the time period before NSOs actually began to implement the changes proposed in their quadrennial plan. The Boardroom archetype, refers to an organizational design in which coordination is achieved through standardized rules and specialized roles; and control is achieved through a volunteer hierarchy of authority. There were 18 occurrences of this archetype throughout the entire QPP period. Finally, the Executive Office archetype, which is coordinated by standardized administrative and technical systems; and controlled through professional expertise, occurred in 12 cases across the QPP period.

One way to assess the decision making structures of design archetypes is to examine the means for each of the six decision topics. Table IV-1 reports the means for each variable of the decision making structure. For each decision topic, the top row shows the degree of formalization, the second row shows the locus of decision making, and the third row shows the levels of involvement in decisions. Given the six decisions were selected as meaningful for QPP implementation, it was felt that comparisons between archetypes should consider the responses to these decisions in combination, rather than isolating each decision. Consequently, multiple comparisons were carried out between design archetypes for each of the decision making structure variables to assess the differences between design archetypes.

Proposition 1 stated that design archetypes will show the greatest difference in their decision making structure in their "less strategic" (i.e., training, coaching development, officiating development) decisions. The claim made earlier was that certain decision topics may be considered more

critical to QPP outcomes and thus, during the time frame of the QPP would be viewed as important by organizational decision makers. It is this logic that underpins the argument that "strategic" QPP decisions would be tightly coupled to the tradition of volunteer controlled decision making in NSOs.

Across all decisions, the Kitchen Table had significantly lower formalization than both the Boardroom and the Executive Office. Although there were no significant differences between the Boardroom and the Executive Office, in all but one decision (officiating development), the Executive Office had the greatest level of formalization. The results suggest that the formalization of decision making is more closely associated with the structural sophistication of the design archetype than with the decision topic. The formalization of decision making tends to follow the degree of formalization found in other design elements in these design archetypes. Specifically, organizations characteristic of the Boardroom and the Executive Office are progressively more formalized in their systems and structures than the Kitchen Table archetype (see Chapter III).

With respect to the locus of decision making, or the extent to which decisions are centralized at the top of the organization or decentralized to lower levels in the hierarchy, there are no significant differences between the archetypes with respect to the three "strategic" QPP decision topics (athletes, carding, national coach). However, the Kitchen Table is significantly more centralized than both the Boardroom and the Executive Office for the "less strategic" decision topics of training and officiating development. It is also significantly centralized than the Executive Office for the "less strategic" decision of coaching development. Although coaching development is more centralized in the Kitchen Table than the Boardroom the difference is not significant. The data imply, therefore, that the decentralization that occurs in the Boardroom and the Executive Office varies between decision topics. Specifically, decentralization tends to relate to the "importance" of the decision.

Involvement in decision making is not as easy to explain. The data show that across decision topics there is, for the most part, increased involvement moving from the Kitchen Table to the Boardroom and a subsequent reduction in involvement moving from the Boardroom to the Executive Office. The volunteer led decision making structure characteristic of the Boardroom archetype is based on the democratic process requiring a variety of

interests to be considered (cf. Macintosh & Whitson, 1990) thus, as expected, there would be more levels involved in the decision making process for organizations representative of this archetype. Nevertheless, there are few statistically significant differences between the design archetypes indicating that regardless of the decision topic, the involvement of various hierarchical levels in decision making does not differ between NSOs that display full archetypical coherence.

Table IV-1
Mean Scores of Decision Making Variables by Decision Topic for National Sport Organizations Displaying Full Archetypical Coherence, 1984-1988

DECISION	VARIABLE	KITCHEN TABLE N=2	BOARDROOM N=18	EXECUTIVE OFFICE N=12
Athletes	Formalization*	1.00	2.50	2.75
	Locus	3.50	3.67	2.92
	Involvement†	2.00	2.33	1.42
Carding	Formalization*	0.50	2.17	2.92
	Locus	3.50	3.24	2.75
	Involvement	2.00	2.06	2.08
National Coach	Formalization*	1.00	2.11	2.42
	Locus	4.00	4.00	3.33
	Involvement	1.50	2.00	1.50
Training	Formalization*	1.00	1.78	2.00
	Locus*	3.50	2.50	2.58
	Involvement	1.50	1.83	1.42
Coaching Development	Formalization*	1.00	1.78	2.50
	Locus¥	4.00	3.33	2.92
	Involvement	1.50	2.00	1.50
Officiating Development	Formalization*	1.00	2.83	2.58
	Locus*	4.00	3.17	2.67
	Involvement¥	1.00	1.39	1.75
Average	Formalization	0.92	2.20	2.53
	Locus	3.75	3.32	2.86
	Involvement	1.58	1.94	1.61

* Significant differences between the Kitchen Table and the Boardroom; the Kitchen Table and the Executive Office at $p < .05$
† Significant differences between the Boardroom and the Executive Office at $p < .05$
¥ Significant differences between the Kitchen Table and the Executive Office at $p < .05$

There is weak support for Proposition 1. Only locus of decision making tends to hold up to the claim that it will be "less strategic" decisions that will differ between design archetypes. The expectation that differences in the decision making structures of design archetypes will be associated with "less strategic" decisions is not supported for formalization and involvement. Overall, these findings support previous claims that in the study of organizational design, decision making is a complex concept (cf. Carter & Cullen, 1984; Fredrickson, 1986; Greenwood & Hinings, 1976). Given that the contentious issue that surrounds a change in decision making for these organizations is the pressure for professional autonomy, and that the trends observed support a move in this direction for NSOs representative of the Executive Office (see Chapter III), further analysis of the "type" of involvement or the concentration of decision making with specific interest groups may be helpful in shedding some light on these particular findings.

It has been suggested that the critical characteristic of an Executive Office is professionally led decision making. To assess this assertion, Proposition 2 stated that in the Executive Office archetype the concentration of decision making is professionally led and volunteer assisted. In other words, it is a professionally led and volunteer assisted decision making structure that is characteristic of an Executive Office. For NSOs representative of each design archetype, Table IV-2 lists the percentage of decisions made by volunteers and the percentage of decisions volunteers are involved in but do not necessarily finalize.

Table IV-2
Percentage of Decision Making Concentration by Design Archetype

	N	Decisions made by volunteers* (%)	Decisions with volunteer involvement* (%)
EXECUTIVE OFFICE	12	36.11	68.06
BOARDROOM	18	81.48	92.59
KITCHEN TABLE	2	75.00	91.67

* Significant differences between the Executive Office and the Boardroom at $p < .05$

In assessing the "qualitative" difference between design archetypes, it is the percentages displayed by the Executive Office in relation to the Boardroom and the Kitchen Table that are important given it is the movement to the Executive Office that requires a shift in the concentration of decision making. Looking down the columns, significantly fewer decisions are made by volunteers in the Executive Office (36.11%) than in the Boardroom (81.48%); and significantly fewer decisions include volunteer involvement in the Executive Office (68.06%) than in the Boardroom (92.59%). Although the Kitchen Table does not show statistically significant differences, the absolute values indicate that the Kitchen Table, like the Boardroom, has a much higher level of concentration of decision making with volunteers than that of the Executive Office. This would be expected given the contentious issue in moving from either the Kitchen Table or the Boardroom to the Executive Office, lies in the shift of decision making from the hands of volunteers to professional staff.

These results provide further support for the identification of unique decision making structures for design archetypes. More importantly, volunteers in the Executive Office make considerably fewer decisions and are involved to a lesser extent in the decision process, establishing the "qualitative" difference in the decision making structure of this design archetype for NSOs. When volunteers and professional staff are compared, the pattern of involvement indicates that the "qualitative" difference of the Executive Office does in fact show what Slack and Hinings (1987) call a professionally led and volunteer assisted decision making structure. Thus, there is support for Proposition 2. It is the change in the decision making structure of NSOs that will now be addressed.

The Role of Decision Making Structures in Organizational Change

The argument that has been consistently presented thus far is that to fully understand the change in organizational design requires an identification of the high impact system that creates variability in design coherence (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Kanter, 1983). One of the critical areas that was identified for archetypical change was the high impact system of decision making. To understand the role of decision making in change for NSOs it is necessary to examine the patterns of change for these organizations and how they relate to decision making. In the remainder of this chapter, the

relationship between decision making and patterns of change are explored. Specifically, how change in decision making structures (i.e., elements and topics) may help us understand the degree and direction of archetypical change in NSOs.

Patterns of change identified in Chapter III lead to the suggestion that NSOs facing similar pressures between 1984 and 1988 changed in a variety of ways. In addition, during this period, NSOs made changes either toward the Boardroom archetype or the Executive Office archetype. It is important to distinguish these two directions given the argument that the decision making structure seems to be more critical for change to the Executive Office. The next step, then, was to examine the change in decision making structures over time.

Proposition 3a suggested that NSOs with the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring will make decision making changes toward either the Boardroom or the Executive Office in all decision topics. The ranks according to total change in the eight structural attributes of bureaucratic structuring are shown in the second column of Table IV-3 and Table IV-4. The reorientation pattern for NSOs moving toward the Boardroom archetype made the greatest change (rank=1) followed by the unresolved pattern (rank=2) and the reorientation pattern for NSOs moving toward the Executive Office archetype (rank=3). These three patterns were the only patterns that made changes in the eight dimensions of bureaucratic structuring greater than the average changes in these dimensions made by all 36 NSOs. The analysis of decision making change, therefore, will be restricted to these three patterns of change.

The one NSO that followed a reorientation pattern toward the Boardroom archetype, and made the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring, made changes in decision making structure focused on increased formalization and levels of involvement across most decision topics (see Table IV-3). There was no change in the locus of decision making for five of the six decisions. For this NSO, there was little need for change in this aspect of decision making given that the transition was from an "approximate" Kitchen Table design in 1984 where the locus of decision making is at or near the top of the organization. Greater changes are seen in the formalization and involvement in decision making which supports the move from a

Table IV-3
Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for National Sport Organizations Moving Towards the Boardroom Design Archetype, 1984-1988

			Decision Topics					
PATTERN OF CHANGE	**RANK**	**VARIABLE**	**Athletes**	**Carding**	**National Coach**	**Training**	**Coaching Development**	**Officiating Development**
Inertia	5th	Formalization	——	——	30.64	——	——	——
N=1		Locus	——	——	35.05	——	33.28	28.00
		Involvement	——	——	——	——	——	26.74
Convergence	6th	Formalization	——	4.81	7.66	2.77	10.46	8.07
N=6		Locus	12.40	4.93	-8.76	2.75	——	14.00
		Involvement	3.82	3.64	12.43	-8.24	8.28	5.35
Reorientation	1st	Formalization	17.16	28.83	15.32	16.61	31.38	32.28
N=1		Locus	——	——	——	-13.73	——	——
		Involvement	22.93	-43.73	24.85	20.60	——	——
Reversal	8th	Formalization	11.44	14.42	5.11	16.51	5.23	——
N=3		Locus	-9.92	-4.93	11.68	-6.87	-11.09	——
		Involvement	-7.65	7.92	——	——	——	26.74
Population		Formalization	8.10	10.01	7.66	9.23	12.20	3.59
N=36		Locus	-1.65	-2.96	-1.96	-0.42	-5.74	0.82
		Involvement	0.64	-3.75	5.52	1.87	2.57	6.29

Table IV-4
Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for National Sport Organizations Moving Towards the Executive Office Design Archetype, 1984-1988

			Decision Topics					
PATTERN OF CHANGE	**RANK**	**VARIABLE**	**Athletes**	**Carding**	**National Coach**	**Training**	**Coaching Development**	**Officiating Development**
Inertia	7th	Formalization	——	7.21	-7.66	16.61	-7.84	-8.07
N=2		Locus	14.88	14.79	35.05	13.73	-8.32	-7.00
		Involvement	——	10.93	-12.43	-10.30	-12.42	-13.37
Convergence	4th	Formalization	8.58	7.21	11.49	8.30	15.69	——
N=4		Locus	-3.71	-3.70	-17.53	——	16.64	——
		Involvement	-5.73	5.47	6.21	5.15	16.56	13.37
Reorientation	3rd	Formalization	9.80	10.30	8.75	9.49	17.93	-2.31
N=7		Locus	-6.38	-4.23	-5.01	——	-9.51	2.00
		Involvement	-6.55	-18.74	-7.10	-5.89	——	-7.64
Unresolved	2nd	Formalization	11.44	12.01	6.38	9.69	13.07	6.73
N=12		Locus	-6.20	-9.41	-4.38	-2.50	-14.79	-6.36
		Involvement	5.73	-3.98	12.43	11.24	2.76	9.73
Polulation		Formalization	8.10	10.01	7.66	9.23	12.20	3.59
N=36		Locus	-1.65	-2.96	-1.96	-0.42	-5.74	0.82
		Involvement	0.64	-3.75	5.52	1.87	2.57	6.29

decision making structure characteristic of a Kitchen Table to one characteristic of a Boardroom (see Chapter III).

In terms of the unresolved pattern, that was ranked 2nd for change in bureaucratic structuring, these NSOs did not make enough changes to achieve full Executive Office status by 1988. Results in Chapter III found that NSOs following the unresolved pattern had an "indeterminate" organizational design at the end of the QPP. That is, they had organizational characteristics of both the Executive Office and the Boardroom archetypes. This lack of organizational design coherence is reflected here in an incomplete shift in the decision making structure across all decision topics. By increasing the formalization of decision making and decentralizing the locus of decision making across all six decision topics, these NSOs show shifts in their decision making structure reflective of a move toward the Executive Office. However, these NSOs also increased their levels of involvement in all but one decision (selection of athletes for carding), a move that reflects a decision making structure characteristic of the Boardroom (see Table IV-4). This mix in the change of decision making involving both characteristics of an Executive Office and Boardroom archetype may have contributed to the "indeterminate" design of these organizations by the end of the change period.

Looking at the changes in decision making for the reorientation pattern for NSOs moving toward the Executive Office, it may be suggested from the results in Table IV-4 that these NSOs made changes in the hypothesized direction across all decision topics. Substantial movement toward the Executive Office archetype involved shifts toward decentralized decision making and reduced involvement in the decision making structure. Specifically, there was little variation in the degree of change between decisions. This lends support for the claim that the high impact system of decision making seems to be critical for transitions toward the Executive Office archetype. There is, then, some support for Proposition 3a. NSOs following two of the three patterns of change that made the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring changed decision making across all decision topics to cohere with their direction of change. Specifically, Proposition 3a seems to be limited to those organizations that made reorientations in their design.

The change in decision making structures can be further assessed by examining the changes in the concentration of decision making. Proposition

3b suggested that for NSOs that have made the greatest increase in bureaucratic structuring toward the Executive Office, a change in the concentration of decision making from volunteers to professionals would be evident. It is clear from Table IV-5 that changes in this regard were minimal. Although the results for Proposition 3a found that the reorientation and the unresolved patterns made changes in their decision making structure that indicated a shift toward more professionally led decision making, a critical part of this change did not occur. Although NSOs following the unresolved pattern did reduce the concentration of decision making in the hands of volunteers, these changes were not substantial enough to indicate a shift in responsibilities from volunteers to professional staff. The reorientation pattern actually increased volunteer concentration over the four year period. Similarly, the NSOs that followed an inertia pattern by maintaining full Executive Office status throughout the QPP, increased volunteer involvement in decision making. These results point out the strong values that these organizations have for the tradition of volunteer governance which comes to the forefront during periods of organizational change. Overall, the results in Table IV-5 indicate that substantial increases in bureaucratic structuring do not necessarily go hand in hand with substantial "qualitative" changes in the high impact system of decision making. The concentration of decision making remained within the traditional characteristics of volunteer led and professionally assisted decision making structures.

In effect, moving decisions down the hierarchy and reducing involvement did not translate into autonomy for professionally led decision making, rather decisions were more likely delegated to functional committees made up of volunteers ***and*** professional staff. NSOs following these patterns of change maintained an aspect of the decision making structure that is culturally tied to these organizations, that is, formal decision making concentrated in the hands of volunteers. In addition, the magnitude of the percentages in Table IV-5 indicate that for the most part, decision making was in the hands of volunteers for most patterns of change throughout the QPP period. With respect to whole scale design change toward the Executive Office archetype, the preceding analysis suggests that Proposition 3b was not supported by the data. Most NSOs made substantial changes in bureaucratic

structuring without making a "qualitative" shift in the concentration of decision making.

Table IV-5
Percentage of Decision Making Concentration for Patterns of Change

PATTERN OF CHANGE	N	Decisions Made by Volunteers (%) Year 1984	1988	Decisions With Volunteer Involvement (%) Year 1984	1988
INERTIA					
Executive Office	2	33.3	33.3	41.7	75.0
Boardroom	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
CONVERGENCE					
Executive Office	4	66.7	45.8	66.7	83.3
Boardroom	6	66.7	63.9	75.0	91.7
REORIENTATION					
Executive Office	7	73.8	85.7	85.7	92.9
Boardroom	1	83.3	83.3	83.3	100.0
UNRESOLVED					
Executive Office	12	72.2	69.4	84.7	72.2
REVERSAL					
Boardroom	3	77.8	88.9	77.8	94.4
TOTAL	36	70.4	69.9	78.7	84.3

An interesting and supportive finding is the low percentage of decisions made by volunteers in NSOs following the convergence pattern toward the Executive Office. These organizations showed a decrease over the four years. This finding indicates that decision making change may be what Tolbert and Zucker (1983) call "emergent" change. That is, once NSOs begin to display the structural characteristics of the Executive Office, decision making structures begin to slowly change to reflect this design. Most important for understanding change toward a more professional and bureaucratic form are the results displayed by the NSOs that maintained Executive Office status for the entire QPP period (inertia pattern). These NSOs were the only

organizations to reflect a professionally led decision making structure (see Table IV-5). In Tolbert and Zucker's (1983) terms, these organizations may be called "early adopters" of the Executive Office. Also interesting, is that over the QPP period, these organizations displayed a substantial increase in the percentage of decisions with volunteer involvement (1984=41.67%; 1988=75%).

These key differences between NSOs that followed either the convergence and inertia pattern toward the Executive Office archetype supports the claim that organizations representative of the Executive Office have a "qualitatively" different decision making structure and also provides support for the emergence of the this archetype as a viable form for this set of NSOs. Over the 1984-1988 period, therefore, NSOs characteristic of the Executive Office built momentum toward heightening archetypical characteristics, in this case, professionally led and volunteer assisted decision making.

In an effort to assess the decision making change for NSOs making complete reorientations to the Executive Office Proposition 4 stated that such organizations would make decision making changes across decision topics and shift the concentration of decision making toward professional staff. Table IV-6 shows inconsistent changes in the decision making structure for six of the seven NSOs following a reorientation toward the Executive Office. By 1988 these organizations had an "approximate" Executive Office design. That is, they had made significant changes in their structure and systems but did not make a substantive overall change in the locus of decision making nor in the levels of involvement in the decision process to reflect the type of structure characteristic of an Executive Office archetype. By contrast, the one NSO that did achieve full Executive Office status, was the only organization to make whole scale change in decision making.

A more illustrative picture of the importance of decision making to these organizations is provided when examining the data in Table IV-7. It is shown here that, for all NSOs, decision making remained concentrated in the hands of volunteers. There was no substantial difference between the one NSO that achieved Executive Office status and those that were "approximate". What this tells us is that although the form of the decision making structure may have shifted (i.e., increased formalization, decreased locus of decision

Table IV-6
Change in Standard Scores of Decision Making Topics for Reorientations Towards the Executive Office Design Archetype, 1984-1988

National Sport Organization	VARIABLE	Decision Topics: Athletes	Carding	National Coach	Training	Coaching Development	Officiating Development
Swimming*	Formalization	17.16	14.42	—	—	—	—
	Locus	—	-29.58	-35.05	-27.46	-16.64	-28.00
	Involvement	-22.93	-43.73	-24.85	-20.60	-24.84	-26.74
Synchronized Swimming	Formalization	17.16	14.42	30.64	16.61	15.69	—
	Locus	—	—	-17.53	—	-16.64	-14.00
	Involvement	-22.93	-21.87	—	20.60	—	—
Diving	Formalization	—	14.42	—	16.61	—	—
	Locus	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Involvement	22.93	-21.87	—	20.60	—	—
Cross Country Ski	Formalization	17.16	14.42	—	16.61	31.38	—
	Locus	—	—	17.53	—	-33.28	—
	Involvement	22.93	-21.87	-49.71	-41.20	—	-26.74
Women's Basketball	Formalization	—	—	—	—	47.06	—
	Locus	14.88	14.79	—	13.73	—	56.00
	Involvement	—	—	—	—	—	—
Table Tennis	Formalization	—	14.42	15.32	16.61	15.69	—
	Locus	-29.77	-14.79	—	13.73	—	—
	Involvement	-45.87	—	—	—	—	—
Figure Skating	Formalization	17.16	—	15.32	—	15.69	—
	Locus	-29.77	—	—	—	—	—
	Involvement	22.93	-21.87	24.85	-20.60	24.84	26.74
AVERAGE CHANGE	Formalization	8.10	10.01	7.66	9.23	12.20	3.59
	Locus	-1.65	-2.96	-1.95	-0.42	-5.74	0.82
	Involvement	0.64	-3.75	5.52	1.87	2.57	6.29

* Achieved full Executive Office Status by 1988

making, decreased involvement in decision making) for the "complete" reorientation, the "qualitative" change has not occurred.

Although value shifts are not directly reported in the data, the level of concentration of decision making provides a good indicator of the extent to which decision making has shifted from volunteers to professionals. It is observed here that although the structure of decision making made a shift reflecting a move toward professionally led decision making, the "qualitative" shift was not supported. The expectation of Proposition 4, that reorientations and/or archetypical change to the Executive Office design archetype requires a change in the concentration of decision making is not supported. What seems to be required for complete reorientations for these organizations is whole scale change in elements of bureaucratic structuring (e,g., standardization and specialization) rather than design elements that require a change in behaviour (e.g., decision making).

Table IV-7
Percentage of Decision Making Concentration for Executive Office Reorientations

	Decisions Made by Volunteers (%)		Decisions With Volunteer Involvement (%)	
	Year		Year	
NSO	1984	1988	1984	1988
Swimming*	66.7	83.3	83.3	83.3
Synchronized Swimming	83.3	100.0	83.3	100.0
Diving	83.3	83.3	83.3	83.3
Cross Country Ski	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0
Women's Basketball	33.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
Table Tennis	83.3	66.7	83.3	100.0
Figure Skating	66.7	83.3	66.7	83.3
AVERAGE	73.8	85.7	85.7	92.9

* Achieved full Executive Office Status by 1988

Discussion

In this chapter the purpose was to determine whether decision making structures differ among design archetypes and to what extent major organizational design change requires a shift in decision making structures. There was no attempt to ***predict*** change, rather the aim was to ***understand*** change. In Chapter's II and III arguments were established to support the variety in organizational design and patterns of change for NSOs, this chapter develops the model further by demonstrating how the elements of decision making have different consequences for design archetypes and organizational change.

Many researchers have identified decision making as a critical issue for organizational design and change (cf. Beyer, 1981; Carter & Culler, 1984; Fredrickson, 1986; Hickson et al., 1986; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Langley, 1989, 1990). In addition, the sport literature has identified the role of volunteers and professionals in decision making as a critical issue for change in NSOs (cf. Goldfarb Report, 1986; Hinings & Slack, 1987; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1988). Although it has been acknowledged repeatedly, rarely has the role of decision making been the principle focus in understanding organizational change. The results presented here lend support for the thesis that decision making is in fact a high impact system for organizational design change.

The results of Proposition 1 did not provide strong support for the claim that between the design archetypes, the structure of decision making will show that differences are greater for "less strategic" decisions over "strategic" decisions. It may be that the limited number of QPP specific decision topics assessed in this analysis were not sufficient to operationalize "less strategic" versus "strategic" decisions. Nevertheless, these results support previous claims that organizational designs have unique decision making structures. Regardless of the topic for decision, in the Kitchen Table archetype there is little variation in the decision making structure across decisions. Specifically, there is little formalization and few levels involved in the decision process, and the locus of decision making is centralized across all decisions. Thus, there is no value preference in the Kitchen Table that results in decision making differences across topics. This does not support earlier claims that design archetypes will display different decision making structures for more "strategic" QPP decisions versus "less strategic" QPP decisions. However,

when examined in context, these findings seem logical. Recall that the Kitchen Table design appeared only in 1984, before NSOs actually began to implement changes and that the domain of the Kitchen Table archetype is both mass/domestic sport and high performance sport (see Chapter II for details on domain). In essence, one might expect there to be very little variety in the manner in which decisions are made because this archetype appeared prior to pressures to focus solely on high performance objectives and was, for this set of NSOs a "pre-QPP" archetype. Thus, the QPP influence on decision making should not be evident in the Kitchen Table largely because it appeared prior to the QPP.

In the Boardroom and the Executive Office archetypes there is more variation in the decision making structures between decision topics. This suggests the topic for decisions may be more relevant to these archetypes. Specifically, for the Boardroom and the Executive Office, the "strategic" QPP decisions reflect core values for volunteer led decision making structures. These results support previous findings that decentralization occurs as organizations become more sophisticated and occurs for less important decisions (cf. Fredrickson, 1986; Jennergren, 1981). Also, there is support for Hickson et al.'s (1986) claim that for "strategic" decisions, it is the topic that determines the structure of decision making. These results also provide additional support for the general thesis that the high impact system of decision making is more critical for reorientations between the Boardroom and the Executive Office archetype.

The findings of Proposition 2 provided support for the claim that the qualitative difference of the Executive Office design archetype lies in the concentration of decision making which is professionally led and volunteer assisted. Although volunteer controlled decision making is tightly coupled to the core values of all NSOs, when concentration of decision making is considered for the Executive Office archetype, then indeed professionals do have a voice in decision making. These results give support to the argument that decision making is in fact a high impact system for organizational design change. It is necessary, however, to consider both the dimensions of decision making structures and the topics for decision making when trying to understand the patterns of change in these NSOs.

In exploring the role of the high impact system in strategic change, the results of Proposition 3a found that it was NSOs following a reorientation

pattern toward either the Executive Office or the Boardroom archetype that made decision making changes that supported their respective increases in bureaucratic structuring. Nevertheless, from the results of Proposition 3b it is suggested that the qualitative change in decision making was less likely to be adopted by these organizations undergoing major change. Based on these findings it is difficult to answer whether archetypical change requires a change in the high impact system of decision making. Theoretically, the answer is yes, the Executive Office archetype has a qualitatively different decision making structure that must be adopted for design coherence. In addition, the inertia pattern indicated that for these organizations the decision making structure of the Executive Office was qualitatively different. That is, NSOs that maintained Executive Office status for the entire 4 years were the only organizations to display a decision making structure where few decisions were finalized by volunteers. In the analysis of archetypical change, however, the results suggest that the qualitative shift in decision making is not required for NSOs to ***adopt*** the Executive Office archetype. It is possible, however, that it is the qualitative shift that enables NSOs to ***maintain*** archetypical status for a period of time.

Hinings and Greenwood (1988) suggest that in periods of stability or evolutionary change (as experienced by an inertia pattern) inconsistencies between organizational elements may not be sufficient to cause substantial design change. When there are contextual pressures to change, however, the existing design archetype can influence the degree and direction of change. Therefore, as the pressure to alter structures, systems, and processes increases, the tolerance for incompatibilities within coherent organizational designs is reduced. "A key question becomes the degree of tolerance that can exist within an organization over the actual divergence between organizational elements" (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988, p. 121). For NSOs, the implementation of their quadrennial plans did not explicitly denounce the Boardroom archetype, however, NSOs did experience pressures to adopt systems and structures that were characteristic of an Executive Office archetype.

It would be expected that NSOs following an inertia pattern would not undergo substantial changes in their high impact system. This was not the case, however, for the one NSO that maintained Boardroom status throughout the 1984-1988 period. In essence, the dramatic changes made in

the high impact system enabled this organization to resist these pressures and maintain a decision making structure coherent with the Boardroom archetype. The two NSOs that followed an inertia pattern and maintained full Executive Office status also made decision making changes across various decision topics. However, the one NSO that maintained full Boardroom status throughout the 1984-1988 period is particularly interesting because it raises the question of how an organization can stay within an archetype and yet make "dramatic" changes in three decisions.

This NSO made substantial changes in three decisions over the QPP period. Decisions that displayed little formalization and involvement of hierarchical levels in 1984 were changed to reflect the characteristics of the Boardroom decision making structure by 1988. In addition, three decision topics became more centralized during this time period (selection of the national coach, coaching development programs, officiating development programs), those regarding personnel and program issues. By contrast, three decision areas remained unchanged even though upon closer examination they had a decentralized locus of decision making. Two of these decisions, selection of national team athletes and selection of athletes for carding, were considered critical to QPP success and tightly coupled to volunteer governed decision making. It would be expected, therefore, that the locus of decision making would change if pressure was being exerted to move to an Executive Office. In general, however, these decision areas have more objective criteria and are controlled by procedures, thus they may be delegated to administrative or technical committees/specialists. The decision topic regarding training programs also remained decentralized. This would be expected given that decisions on training programs for elite athletes in all NSOs are the responsibility of coaching staff and technical staff (in most cases they are paid) who have positions lower in the hierarchy of authority. As Thibault (1990) states, "since these individuals have the expertise needed for this responsibility, it is perfectly logical that the structure of NSOs allows them a high degree of autonomy to do their work" (p. 10). Macintosh and Whitson (1990) have also discussed the trend toward more specialized committees and a move toward recruiting volunteer executives with special administrative or technical skills rather than broad regional interests typical of traditional volunteer structures. These trends, therefore, contribute to a

more "professionalized" organizational form where decisions are decentralized to both professional staff and volunteers experts.

When decision topics were analyzed at an aggregate level, this organization displayed little change in decision making (see Chapter III). However, a "fine grained" analysis revealed substantial differences in the manner in which decision topics changed. This organization made what Miller and Friesen (1984) call "piecemeal" changes in the decision topics that prior to QPP implementation, lagged behind in terms of "Boardroom" status. Changes in these decision topics enabled the organization to maintain a balance of Boardroom characteristics during a period of substantial change.

Change in high impact systems, for NSOs, therefore, may be more salient for ***maintaining*** rather than ***acquiring*** archetypical coherence during periods of strategic change. As Hinings and Greenwood (1988) point out, " ... maintaining an inertial position may require considerable activity and directed effort" (p. 125). Consequently, the high impact system, which gives the organization meaning, requires acute attention during periods of change.

For NSOs, the qualitative difference in decision making is found in the Executive Office, where the concentration of decision making shows a professionally led and volunteer assisted decision making structure. The findings for Proposition 4, however, showed that reorientations toward the Executive Office archetype did not alter this aspect of their decision making structure. The core value for a volunteer nonprofit orientation is the key source of this stability which constrains the range of decision making structures that are viable for this set of organizations and maintains the traditional volunteer controlled decision making structure. In times of change the last area to change is that which is closely tied to the core values of the organization. There is a desire to hang on to everything that supports the status quo (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

In this period of strategic change, it was the direction of change and the dimensions of the decision making structure rather than the topic for decision that were critical for NSOs. It is here where strong values for volunteer led decision making surfaced. A focus on the decision topic helped us understand the differences between stable organizational design archetypes for a particular set of organizations, however, the topic for decision was less relevant for understanding the change between organizational designs.

Conclusions

In addition to these specific observations, a number of issues may be raised. First, the similarities and differences in decision making structures found between design archetypes and patterns of change provide support for a comprehensive understanding of the role of decision making as a high impact system of organizational design change. Second, the empirical findings reported here support the literature which proposes that core values that are deeply tied to high impact systems have substantial influence on the adoption of new structures.

The basis of the archetype argument is that structure is a reflection of values about what is worthwhile to accomplish, what procedures are considered legitimate, and how to determine the effectiveness of accomplishments (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988). The key to archetypical change, then, is a whole scale shift in structure, systems, and values or a fundamental change in the organization's framework and meaning (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988a,b; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) found that for organizations undergoing archetypical change, " ... the tug and push of strategic change centred on the high impact system which embodied the core values of the organization" (p. 116). Similarly, Tushman and Romanelli (1985) state, " ... previous structures, systems and values become part of the organization's past. These historical forces embody the organization's past procedures and values and become inertial forces which resist the implementation of new strategies and systems" (p. 205).

Based on these arguments, archetypical change for NSOs was expected to involve initial changes in the high impact system of decision making which is underpinned by a strong values for a volunteer "self help" orientation. However, for most NSOs that made changes over the 1984-1988 period, professional decision making has not been legitimated. These organizations, some of which are structurally very close to the Executive Office, have maintained a volunteer controlled and professionally supported decision making structure. It is expected that because of the tight coupling of values to the decision making structure that changes in this respect will emerge slowly for this set of organizations.

This issue comes closer to Tushman and Romanelli's (1985) idea of "re-creations". In their work on strategic change these authors distinguish

between organizations that make "frame-bending" changes without making shifts in core values (i.e., reorientations) and those organizations that make "frame-breaking" changes in structure, systems, and core values (i.e., re-creations) (cf. Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). According to these authors the latter are extremely disruptive and are very rare because they involve a shift in the most fundamental values that give meaning to the organization. In an effort to distinguish between "reorientations" and "re-creations" in this study, a closer look at NSOs that followed the reorientation pattern toward the Executive Office indicated that a change in the most fundamental values that characterize this archetype, professionally led and volunteer assisted decision making, was not made.

In their analysis of NSOs, Slack and Thibault (1988) state, "the shift to a more professional and bureaucratic organizational form is likely to continue and become relatively entrenched" (p. 152). They further state that in these organizations, a professionally led decision making structure is valued as a legitimate way to operate because it assists the functioning of the organization. By contrast, the suggestion here is that the emergence of the Executive Office archetype for a few NSOs has not translated into the widespread adoption of this form. The critical point to make is that although NSOs made substantial changes toward the Executive Office archetype in both design and decision making, the "qualitative" shift in the "kind" of decision making structure was not evident for these NSOs. The results of this study suggest that initial adoption of an "emergent" design archetype (e.g., Executive Office) is achieved through adopting the appropriate framework across all organizational design elements in order to facilitate the emergent change in behaviours.

As Tolbert and Zucker (1983) suggest, it may be that qualitative change (i.e., change in behaviour) takes time to emerge after the structure is achieved. In Kanter's (1983) terms, the change in these structural elements may be considered "action vehicles" that will guide the "qualitative" shift in decision making. Similarly, based on their findings, Hinings and Greenwood (1988a) state, "those organizations which successfully manage transformations create a considerable level of initial change activity focused on actions which will produce behavioural changes" (p. 139). Based on these arguments, therefore, it would be premature to conclude that the Executive

Office archetype is fully established for this set of NSOs. In effect, the Executive Office has not been established as the "dominant" form for NSOs. Nevertheless, the Executive Office has emerged as a "viable" organizational form.

It will take time before professionally led decision making displaces values for a volunteer led decision making that is deeply embedded in the history of these organizations. As Kimberly (1984) points out,

> design decisions made early in the life of an organization (along with decisions about governance, expertise, and domain) set in on a course which is difficult to change. These decisions are often not made with any real understanding of their long-term significance, and yet their consequences are pervasive (p. 124).

Until professionally led decision making is viewed as a legitimate alternative, traditional volunteer led decision making will not be dramatically changed. These issues require further analysis, it seems clear, however, from this research that the high impact system of decision making for organizational design change demands closer attention by policy makers, administrators, consultants, and researchers who are interested in managing or understanding organizational change.

Bibliography

Baka, R.S.P. (1978). A history of provincial government involvement in sport in western Canada. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Bartenuk, J.M., & Franzak, F.J. (1988). The effects of organizational restructuring on frames of reference and cooperation. Journal of Management, 14, 579-592.

Beyer, J.M. (1981). Ideologies, values, and decision making in organizations. In P.C. Nystrom & W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design Vol 2: Remodelling organizations and their environments (pp. 166-202). New York: Oxford University Press.

Carter, N.M., & Cullen, J.B. (1984). A comparison of centralization/ decentralization of decision making concepts and measures. Journal of Management, 10, 259-268.

Child, J. (1972). Organization structure and strategies of control: A replication of the Aston study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 163-177.

Child, J. (1973). Strategies of control and organizational behavior. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 1-17.

Cunningham, D., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Changing design archetypes in amateur sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 59-81). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Dastmalchian, A., & Javidan, M. (1987). Centralization and organizational context: An analysis of Canadian public enterprises. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 4, 302-319.

Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1990). Issue: High performance management issues, a group discussion. Proceedings of For excellence: A symposium on Canadian high performance sport (pp. 50-51). February 12-14, 1989. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Fredrickson, J.W. (1986). The strategic decision process and organizational structure. Academy of Management Review, 11, 280-297.

Frisby, W. (1983). The organizational structure and effectiveness of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.

Frisby, W. (1986). The organizational structure and effectiveness of voluntary organizations: The case of Canadian national sport governing bodies. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 4, 61-74.

Gersick, C.J.G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. Academy of Management Review, 16, 10-36.

Goldfarb Consultants. (1986, May). The state of the volunteer-professional relationship in amateur sport in Canada. A research report for the Canadian Olympic Association.

Government of Canada. (1990, December). Amateur sport: Future challenges. Second report of the standing committee on Health & Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women. Sub-Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport. Ottawa: Author.

Greaves, H.R. (1976). The sports development policy of the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association: 1961-1976. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1976). Centralization revisited. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 151-155.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization Studies, 9, 293-316.

Harvey, J., & Proulx, R. (1988). Sport and the Canadian state. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 93-119). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Hickson, D.J., Butler, R.J., Cray, D., Mallory, G.R., & Wilson, D.C. (1986). Top decisions: Strategic decision making in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988a). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988b). The normative prescription of organizations. In L.G. Zucker (Ed.), Institutional patterns and organizations (pp. 53-70). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger.

Hinings, C.R., & Slack, T. (1987). The dynamics of quadrennial plan implementation in national sport organizations. In T. Slack & C.R. Hinings (Eds.), The organization and administration of sport (pp. 127-151). London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Howell, M.L., & Howell, R.A. (1985). Canadian sport in perspective. In M.L. Howell & R.A. Howell (Eds.), History of sport in Canada (revised edition) (pp. 396-417). Champaign, Illinois: Stipes.

Jennergren, L.P. (1981). Decentralization in organizations. In P.C. Nystrom & W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), Handbook of organizational design Vol 2: Remodeling organizations and their environments (pp. 39-59). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). The change masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class, power, and the Canadian state. In P.J. Galasso (Ed.), Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kimberly, J.R. (1984). The anatomy of organizational design. Journal of Management, 10, 109-126.

Kimberly, J.R. (1987). The study of organization: Toward a biographical perspective. In J.W. Lorsch (Eds.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 223-237). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kimberly, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 595-622.

Langley, A. (1989). In search of rationality: The purposes behind the use of formal analysis in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 34, 598-631.

Langley, A. (1990). Patterns in the use of formal analysis in strategic decisions. Organization Studies, 11, 17-45.

Macintosh, D. (1988). The federal government and voluntary sport associations. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 121-139). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Macintosh, D., Bedecki, T., & Franks, C.E.S. (1987). Sport and politics in Canada: Federal government involvement since 1961. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Middleton, M. (1987). Nonprofit boards of directors: Beyond the governance function. In W.W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 141-153). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1984). Organization: A quantum view. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M.L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. The Academy of Management Executive, 3, 194-204.

Pugliese, D., & Taylor, B. (1977). Sport and the volunteer at the national level. Ottawa: National Sport and Recreation Centre Inc.

Quinn, R.E., & McGrath, M.R. (1985). The transformation of organizational cultures: A competing values perspective. In P. Frost, L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis, C.C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 315-334). Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 1-17.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley & G. Salaman (Eds.), The international yearbook of organizational studies (pp. 197-221). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schrodt, B. (1983). Changes in the governance of amateur sport in Canada. Canadian Journal of History of Sport, 14, 1-20.

Skivington, J.E., & Daft, R.L. (1991). A study of organizational 'framework' and 'process' modalities for the implementation of business-level strategic decisions. Journal of Management Studies, 28, 45-68.

Slack, T. (1985). The bureaucratization of a voluntary sport organization. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 20, 145-166.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1987). Planning and organizational change: A conceptual framework for the analysis of amateur sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 12, 185-193.

Slack, T., & Thibault, L. (1988). Values and beliefs: Their role in the structuring of national sport organizations. Arena Review, 12, 140-155.

Task Force Report. (1988). Toward 2000: The Report of the task force on national sport policy. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Thibault, L. (1990, September). Dubin's recommendations: The potential impact on National Sport Organizations. Paper presented at the conference After the Dubin Inquiry: Implications for Canada's High-Performance Sport System, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1991). Professionalism, structures and systems: The impact of professional staff on voluntary sport organizations, International Review for Sociology of Sport, 26, 83-99.

Tolbert, P.S., & Zucker, L.G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 22-39.

Tushman, M.L., Newman, W.H., & Romanelli, E. (1986). Convergence and upheaval: Managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution. California Management Review, 29, 29-44.

Tushman, M.L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 7 (pp. 171-222). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1988). The professionalization of Canadian amateur sport: Questions of power and purpose. Arena Review, 12, 81-96.

CHAPTER V

General Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this final chapter is to relate the separate studies, presented in Chapter's II, III, and IV, to each other and to relevant issues for organizational change in general, and for national sport organizations (NSOs) in particular. The first section presents a summary and discussion of the conceptual model for understanding change established in Chapter II. In particular, the model's utility and limitations in the analysis of organizational design change presented in Chapter's III and IV are assessed. The concepts of design archetypes, patterns of change, and high impact systems will also be revisited in an effort to draw some wider conclusions with respect to the strategic change in the organizational design of NSOs. In the second and final section, research implications and issues, that have been raised through the findings of the studies which constitute the body of this thesis, are discussed. In addition, a number of possibilities for further theoretical development and research are addressed.

Summary and Concluding Points

In Chapter I a rationale for examining change in NSOs was provided by establishing a broad analysis of forces that have influenced the development of the Canadian sport delivery system. It was argued that during the 1970's and the early 1980's, most NSOs made evolutionary gains toward a more professional and bureaucratic form. Changes during this time were made in reaction to the increased environmental complexity for NSOs and the rise in government involvement in the delivery of amateur sport in Canada. Specifically, NSOs made adaptations in certain areas (e.g., increased systematization of coaching programs, hiring paid staff) in response to specific issues. These changes were not intended to alter the structure of voluntary governance that underpins the fundamental nature of these organizations. Rather, the intention was to make these changes in an effort to assist volunteers in the governance of their organizations. By contrast, the introduction of the QPP, in 1984, marked a move from an evolution of organizational forms to an attempt at revolutionary change. It was during this time that NSOs' quadrennial plans were implemented which resulted in structural design shifts that pressured for change in the fundamental values

of these organizations. Changes involved the hiring of professional staff with the expectation that they would assist with the implementation of NSOs' quadrennial plans. However, the shift in roles and responsibilities of professional staff during this time period resulted in a move toward a more professionally led and volunteer assisted organizational form. Thus, change during the 1984-1988 period influenced the most fundamental value of NSOs, that of volunteer led decision making.

To aid our understanding of strategic change in NSOs, Chapter II delineated three institutionally specific design archetypes: Kitchen Table, Boardroom, Executive Office. It is important to emphasize that the central idea behind establishing design archetypes is to provide a model for understanding organizational phenomena. Laughlin's (1991) statement about models of organizational change developed in his study is applicable to design archetypes when he states,

> these models are intentionally pitched at a highly general level allowing both variety and diversity in any empirical outworking ... They can be likened to 'skeletons' which need the (empirical) 'flesh' to make them meaningful 'whole beings'. Just as there is diversity of human beings, so is it expected that there should, and will, be a variability in the empirical details surrounding the skeletal models (p. 210).

In effect, the issue was not whether the design archetypes uncovered for NSOs had a substantial number of empirical referents, rather the issue was how the structural design elements and organizational values uncovered from documentary and empirical studies helped describe these constant relations and how they changed over time.

As such, the design archetypes established in Chapter II help account for the patterns of change in NSOs and were less measures of "successful" organizational design change and more a heuristic device to understand organizational phenomena (cf. Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Kimberly, 1984; Laughlin, 1991; McKinney, 1966; Mintzberg, 1991). It was suggested that during the 1970's the Kitchen Table archetype began to lose legitimacy and there were external forces on NSOs to adopt a more professional and bureaucratic form or what was labelled the Boardroom archetype. It was argued further that with the introduction of the QPP, the Boardroom archetype began to lose legitimacy and there were additional pressures on NSOs to adopt an Executive Office archetype.

By providing anchor points for the analysis of organizational change, the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office archetypes provided a

tool to assess the extent to which empirical examples approximated these designs and how they changed among and between them over time. In Chapter III, the empirical examination of the design archetypes provided support for the existence of these design archetypes. More importantly, these archetypes aided the analysis by identifying the variety in organizational design and patterns of change for NSOs. Supporting the literature on organizational change (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Laughlin, 1991; Miller & Friesen, 1984), the findings in Chapter III showed that NSOs experiencing the same environmental pressure for change react in different ways. An important finding was that these organizations made few changes in their decision making structures during the QPP period.

The idea that some areas of the organization may resist change highlighted what Hinings and Greenwood (1988) label "high impact systems" or those systems and structures that are tightly coupled to the organization's core values. As Hinings and Greenwood (1988) state,

> it may be relatively easy to amalgamate certain departments, thereby reducing differentiation, in some organizations because that does not have a strong impact on the underlying values, but other elements, such as removing a level in the hierarchy or changing the routing of involvement, may produce a much stronger impact precisely because of its crucial relationship to those values (p. 204).

For NSOs, the importance of core values was demonstrated in the stability of volunteer led decision making structures. Thus, within the institutional setting of this research, decision making structures were identified as having a "high impact" on the value shift to the Executive Office design archetype. It is this type of interpretation of NSOs with respect to the criticality of decision making structures that may contribute to our understanding of change in these organizations.

It has been argued that since high impact systems are tightly coupled to the core values of an organization they should lead whole scale change efforts toward a new design archetype (cf. Gersick, 1991; Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Kanter, 1983). For strategic change in NSOs, the results of this research study suggest a more appropriate argument is that as NSOs become more structurally representative of a "qualitatively" different design archetype, their decision making structure (i.e., high impact system) may begin to change to reflect the new design archetype. This interpretation is given support by Laughlin's (1991) explanation of transitions and transformations. Specifically, he claims that the "interpretive scheme [or fundamental core values of an

organization] does have the possibility of accepting a number of different design archetypes without the coherence of organizational life being substantially challenged" (p. 217). In addition, he suggests that any attempt to change the organization's core values through a substantial shift in the design archetype, is a task that is both difficult and time consuming. It may be, that volunteer governance is in Laughlin's (1991) terms, the "interpretive scheme" for NSOs.

In an effort to add a new dimension to our understanding of organizational change in NSOs, Chapter IV placed the often debated issue of volunteer and professional roles in a new light. Specifically, it was established that the difficulty NSOs have in adopting the Executive Office design archetype lies in the qualitative shift required in the structure of decision making. NSOs, it was argued, have changed certain aspects of their high impact system of decision making to cohere with the design of the Executive Office. However, elements that signal a shift in control from volunteers to professionals did not occur within the 4 year period of the QPP.

With the decision making structure of the Boardroom archetype building on the volunteer controlled structure of the Kitchen Table archetype, the shift in decision making between these two design archetypes was found to be less traumatic. Although the Boardroom was substantially more sophisticated in design, it maintained the fundamental value of volunteer control. By contrast, movement toward the Executive Office archetype was more difficult for NSOs because it involved a change from volunteer to professional control over decision making. In this case, archetypical change also required a change in the fundamental value for volunteer governance that underpins all NSOs.

Emphasizing the role of high impact systems in design change, this research has demonstrated that within the high impact system of decision making there are certain components that are more critical than others in signalling a shift to a new design and are thus, more resistant to change. For NSOs, the formalization of decisions, the locus of decision making, and the levels of involvement in the decision process were changed to signal a general shift toward more professional involvement. However, the concentration of decision making, that high impact component which defines which interest group (e.g., volunteers, professional staff) has control over decision making, did not show dramatic changes toward professional control. For organizations attempting to make the change to an Executive Office

archetype, changes in decision making are restricted to the centralization or decentralization of the locus of decision making and the formalization of the decision making process. Changes in behaviour, specifically the involvement in decisions and the concentration of decision making with particular interest groups, lags behind.

The point made here is that the concepts of design archetypes, patterns of change, and high impact systems provided a useful framework for understanding organizational design change within an institutionally specific set of organizations. Chapter's III and IV provided empirical studies of organizational design change for a set of NSOs involved in the most direct effort to alter their, structure, systems, and processes since the introduction of professional staff and geographically centralized national offices in the early 1970's. In particular, the Kitchen Table, the Boardroom, and the Executive Office archetypes assisted the interpretation of the degree and the direction of change experienced by these organizations during the QPP period (1984-1988). The analysis, however, did raise some issues with respect to what is necessary to gain a ***complete*** understanding of strategic change. In particular, the model of archetypical change was challenged by the fact that when core values are the focus of change the role of the historical context is extremely important (cf. Gersick, 1991; Kanter, 1983; Kimberly, 1984). As implied in this study, the historical tradition of volunteer controlled NSOs was a powerful force on the manner in which these organizations responded to pressures for change. The importance of values that have historical and cultural links will be stressed throughout the following discussion on research issues and implications.

Research Implications

The major aim of this research was to analyze the strategic change in the organizational design of NSOs during the tenure of the first QPP. The theoretical and empirical nature of this study focused on the synthesis of literature on organizational change and on the Canadian sport delivery system. The empirical analysis of a set of organizations was limited to the population of NSOs that participated in the QPP between 1984 and 1988. There was no attempt to identify causal relationships and any inference with respect to change must be considered within the context of the study for this population of organizations. Nevertheless, the issues that have been raised have theoretical and empirical associations with previous research on

organizational change in general and with change in the Canadian sport delivery system in particular.

There is no question that the QPP was a major force in shaping the degree and the direction of change in NSOs. In addition, the substantial funding allotment tied to the QPP enabled these organizations to implement many of the changes they had planned. In a sense, the importance attached to high performance sport success at the 1988 Olympic Games provided the impetus for organizational design change in NSOs. Although organizational design change itself was not a formal aspect of the QPP, the implementation of NSOs' quadrennial plans did result in a change in the design arrangements of these organizations. As an external force, then, the QPP provided the context in which to observe and understand how NSOs are designed and how they change.

When planning for change, organizations have to consider the immediate and the long term implications. The QPP was more than simply a high performance sport development plan, it involved organizational design changes in structure, roles, and relationships. The QPP was an explicit attempt to plan for high performance sport outcomes; this was accomplished by initiating changes in the management of technical and administrative services in those NSOs involved in the 1988 Olympic Games. For example, services to athletes were more standardized, administrative controls were increased, and more professional staff were hired. Nevertheless, the important point made here is that, as a consequence of prescribed planning efforts, there were certain emergent changes.

Although the QPP was not an explicit attempt to alter the values for volunteer control in NSOs, the analysis of these organizations has demonstrated that the decision making structure, which was not formally mandated in the "planned" changes outlined in NSOs' quadrennial plans, was decentralized over the time period of the QPP. Emerging from the implementation of NSOs' quadrennial plans were new roles and responsibilities for professional staff that supported a shift in the fundamental value for volunteer governance where the authority of volunteer members in the "boardroom" is replaced by professional staff expertise in the "executive office".

What came out of this planning effort, then, was a change that had a dramatic impact on the organizational design of NSOs. In effect, structural

design change was a result of the prescribed changes espoused in NSOs' quadrennial plans. The agreement on the utility of more specialized roles and more standardized programs for high performance sport, as well as the substantial funding attached to the planning process, resulted in the quick implementation of these changes.

The identification of prescribed and emergent change leads to the issue of organizational choices. Specifically, for NSOs in this study, the interpretation of pressures for change were focused on the specialization and standardization of structural design elements not the decision making structure. The priority attached to planning for high performance sport success and the delicate issue of volunteer-professional relations resulted in implementation problems with respect to shifts in roles and responsibilities that were brought about through quadrennial plan implementation.

Viewed as a technical issue, plans are implemented to initiate change in the desired direction. The assumption is that there is very little difference in values between interest groups and thus, little resistance (Bryson, 1990). Such an assumption, however, ignores the role of values in organizational change. It is here where we have to consider the historical and institutional context of NSOs. Volunteers are critical to the governance of NSOs, thus, externally prescribed change in decision making structures will face stronger resistance. As Kanter (1983) states,

> ... a sense of history can be an important element in providing a culture of security and pride. But denial of the realities of change can make it difficult to hear or admit new ideas ... To say that 'we've always wanted it that way anyway' or that 'our policies espouse this' when practice decidedly departs from that is both to weaken faith in official pronouncements and to make it difficult for anyone to question the effectiveness of implementation (p. 349).

Developing commitment to new core values takes time. New values and beliefs are unfamiliar and the implications of change in these areas are not clear. In areas where resistance is likely, careful attention is required to establish support and commitment to change. In essence, the change must be valued to take hold in the structural design (Kanter, 1983; Laughlin, 1991).

In planning for change, then, there are important issues that need to be addressed. From a management perspective, a comprehensive understanding of change, requires consideration of the impact that prescribed changes have on the " ... activities, norms of behaviour, and ways of operating, that are not formally prescribed" (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988, p.

11). Change that is prescribed may occur more easily than emergent change. Hinings and Greenwood (1988) state, "prescribed changes as a forerunner of emergent change may indicate resistance to design alteration" (p. 36). Resistance tends to occur in emergent areas because they are more critical to the meaning of the organization (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Kanter, 1983; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983; Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). For NSOs, planning for decision making change requires addressing issues of control and authority, potentially altering the core values for volunteer led decision making which gives meaning to the organization. As a contentious issue, then, it was avoided in the formal planning process. Thus, although the immediacy of planning for high performance sport resulted in the quick adoption of prescribed changes in the QPP, (which have in turn pushed NSOs in the direction of the Executive Office) the emergent changes in roles and responsibilities, coupled with the expectation of professionally led decision making, has not been legitimated within this set of organizations.

Future Research Issues

The purpose of this study was to describe how NSOs have changed their organizational designs during the QPP. Future research is required to explain why this change occurred. However, from this analysis of the content of strategic change in NSOs, certain issues that point to a range of future directions toward understanding the causal variables (both internal and external) of organizational change for NSOs may be raised. The following issues are of particular interest: the role of institutional theory and resource dependence require closer attention as forces for change in this institutionally specific set of organizations; the issues of strategic choice and power are also tied to understanding why organizations change the way they do; the importance of decision making structures for organizational design change needs further clarification; and finally, an area which merits further investigation is the applicability of design archetypes as a model for the analysis of change in NSOs beyond 1988.

Research using the theoretical frameworks of institutional theory and resource dependence is particularly relevant to NSOs given that these organizations exist within a network of interaction where they are highly dependent on government policies and funding for programs. Financial assistance for administration, domestic sport programs, and high

performance sport programs, for example, is prioritized by the government funding agency (Sport Canada). It is this control over which aspects of NSOs receive funding that enables Sport Canada to influence the strategic change in NSOs. In particular, as the dominant funding source, Sport Canada's interest in "professionalizing" NSOs and promoting its interest in high performance sport programs is felt by these organizations (Macintosh & Whitson, 1990). As stated in a recent government document,

> ... better planning, coordination and efficiency appear to be a necessity for ensuring effective allocation of public resources. Thus, good administrative management by NSOs is necessary in the use of public funds ... there is a need to encourage and strengthen the capabilities of NSOs in order for them to become more effective national agencies (Government of Canada, 1990, p. 27, 32).

The arguments of institutional theory state that externally controlled or prescribed changes such as those espoused by the government, are adopted by organizations to confirm their legitimacy yet, may have little impact on the actual operations of the organizations (cf. Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983). In NSOs, this could be examined by assessing the causal relationship between funding changes, values of organizational members, and structural design change. Slack and Thibault (1988) have pointed out that during the implementation of the QPP, members of NSOs espoused values of the institutionally prescribed professional and bureaucratic organizational form. During this time frame, however, substantial funds were allocated to NSOs to aid the implementation of the changes in programs and activities which they had outlined in their quadrennial plans. According to the findings reported in this research, it is these changes, in programs and activities, that have resulted in the design shift. Thus, it is important to assess, longitudinally, the stability of the values that Slack and Thibault have identified in order to determine whether this organizational form is in fact "institutionalized" as the way to organize for NSOs or whether it was adopted "ceremoniously" to satisfy funding requirements.

Reactions to environmental and institutional pressures, of course, are interpreted by organizational members, as Hinings and Greenwood (1988) point out, a complete understanding of organizational change requires an analysis of both external and internal forces. Thus, the second research issue that would further our understanding of change in NSOs deals with strategic choice and values. The modification of relationships between structure and values within organizational design change leads to several different

outcomes. The primary interest of organizational theory has been to assess the outcome of effectiveness or performance. However, to obtain a complete perspective of change, Kimberly (1984) suggests that alternate motivations for change must also be acknowledged. With respect to change in NSOs, Macintosh and Whitson's (1990) analysis of the QPP and its impact on NSOs addresses the distribution of power and interests as specific forces of change that have broader implications for the Canadian sport delivery system. While a management perspective highlights the need for certain aspects to be considered for successful change and enhanced effectiveness, the political perspective highlights whose interests are being served through particular policies and programs. Although the framework used in this study does not explore these motivations for change, it provides the foundation for future research to address these questions because within the design archetype model of change, the importance of core values, historical context, and institutional setting have major implications for why organizations change the way they do. One aim of the larger research project (of which this study is a part) on change in national sport organizations conducted at the University of Alberta is to use Hinings and Greenwood's (1988) full model of strategic change.

Hinings and Greenwood (1988) have identified five processes that influence the direction and the rate of change. First, in the tradition of contingency theory, they identify situational constraints as an important precipitating force for change. Second, the commitment to values and beliefs, conceptualized as interpretive schemes, have an important influence on the manner in which organizational members interpret and respond to these situational constraints. A third dynamic is the interests of groups or individuals in securing, maintaining, or enhancing their share of resources. Whether or not interests can be promoted is dependent upon the ability to influence outcomes. Consequently, the fourth dynamic, whether the power structure is concentrated in the hands of a few or shared between interest groups is an important force that enables change or maintains stability. For NSOs, quadrennial plan implementation brought the issue of decision making power to the forefront. It was here where the mistrust between volunteers, the traditional decision makers, and professional staff, the new "experts" has great potential to influence the manner in which these organizations change. The fifth and final dynamic addressed by Hinings and

Greenwood, is the organization's capacity (i.e., leadership, knowledge, and skill) to undertake and complete a transformation in organizational design. It is Hinings and Greenwood's thesis that organizations require transformational leadership to guide archetypical change. In addition, there has to be an understanding of ***why*** the organization has to change, ***how*** it must change, and ***what*** it has to change. According to Hinings and Greenwood, stability and change are enabled or constrained by one or more of these forces acting on an organization, however, the pattern of change is a result of their interaction. The research study presented here provides an initial step in understanding how NSOs have changed. Further indepth analysis of the dynamics of change, as Hinings and Greenwood have conceptualized them, will provide a richer interpretation of why organizations within the same institutional sector followed a variety of patterns of change.

The results of this study support the claim that the time period of 1984-1988 saw substantial changes in the organizational design of NSOs involved in the QPP. This finding is in agreement with Macintosh (1988), Kidd (1988), and others who claim that the involvement of the government in the delivery of amateur sport has had a tremendous impact on the structural design of NSOs. Clearly the substantial funding attached to the development and the implementation of NSOs' quadrennial plans had a significant role in this change. Yet the results of this study also suggest an important constraining factor on the scope of this change. Specifically, the strong ties to volunteer led decision making that is embedded in the history of NSOs had a "high impact" on the extent to which these organizations made whole scale changes toward a qualitatively different organizational design.

The analysis of change in NSOs provided in the preceding chapters illustrates that the high impact system of decision making, as a lever for archetypical change, is constrained by the difficulty alternate decision making structures have in gaining legitimacy. There has been little theoretical concern with the process by which values are tighily coupled to behaviours and as such, influence choices and subsequently the decision making structures in organizations. Future research, therefore, should examine decision making structures within these institutionally specific design archetypes, over a longer period of time, to assess whether high impact

systems are more salient for maintaining stability rather than for leading change. As Kimberly (1984) points out,

> much of the explanation for why an organization looks the way it does today lies in its past. Therefore, to understand its current design it is necessary to develop an appreciation for the constellation of forces which, over time, together moved it on its developmental trajectory. More important, the redesign possibilities for the future are constrained by the past and present (p. 125).

The inertial force is tied to the history of NSOs, consequently, we can not hope to understand specific change periods without considering the organization's past (cf. Kimberly, 1987; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987). When qualitative changes or role expectations shift in NSOs, the high impact system has to be addressed. In many cases, those responsible for managing change give little attention to the fundamental values that characterize structural designs. The security of traditional roles and the value differences have to be considered.

The third issue evolved from the findings of this research which have emphasized the criticality of decision making for understanding organizational design change. Research has suggested that organizational designs have particular decision making structures (cf. Fredrickson, 1986; Langley, 1990). Additionally, in their analysis of decision making, Hickson, Butler, Cray, Mallory, and Wilson (1986) found that the organization's form (e.g., public, private, manufacturing, service) did not play a large role in understanding decision making processes. It should be noted, however, that their analysis of organizational form was limited to the broad characteristics of sectors (i.e., public, private, manufacturing, service) rather than an interpretation of the organizational design in terms of the structural elements of standardization, specialization, and centralization. Hickson et al.'s focus on the decision process did not emphasize design change, rather design was considered stable. By contrast, this study found the elements of the decision making structure rather than the decision making topic to be more helpful in the analysis of organizational design change. Decision topics did not make a strong contribution to our understanding of the variety in organizational design and the patterns of change.

Integrating these two approaches may highlight the role that decision making structures play in periods of stability and change. For example, in periods of evolutionary change, where there is little external pressure to implement whole scale shifts in design, the topic may play more of a role in

the decision making structure. It is suggested that coherent organizational designs, in periods of stability, are focused on internal issues such as who makes and, who is involved in strategic or operational decisions. However, when there are environmental forces on an organization, attention may move from these internal issues to the external issues. Thus, how an organization responds to pressures to make whole scale changes, may be characterized less by the topics of decision making and more by the organization's design. In times of environmental turbulence, decision makers may tend to centralize all decisions in an effort to display control to resist external pressures and gain the commitment of internal members. These ideas, of course, need to be examined.

In an effort to resolve the issue of the role of decision topics in organizational design, future research should examine the importance of decisions and how this importance shifts, over time, during periods of stability and change. In times of stability, the priority of decisions may shift according to the interests, power, and values of the decision makers of the day. Within NSOs, this is particularly important as the decision makers are voted in by the membership on a yearly basis. Also, a major opportunity for future research would be to include a wider range of decisions (e.g., strategic and operational) in the analysis of the role of decision making structures in archetypical design change. A more comprehensive examination of the decision making structure during periods of strategic organizational design change would go far in addressing both issues of decision making as a process and decision making as a high impact system of change.

The final research issue deals with the continued application of this framework for understanding organizational change in the study of the nonprofit sport organizations that constitute Canada's sport delivery system. As we move beyond the strategic change period of the first QPP, there is a different set of pressures acting on the Canadian sport delivery system that have important implications for future research on the strategic change in NSOs. Recently, numerous concerns have been raised about the precarious position of NSOs with respect to their dependence on government. Internationally and domestically, the issue that clouds the present Canadian sport delivery system is the emphasis on high performance sport, which saw its peak and downfall during the period of the first QPP. Specifically, as a result of the positive doping test of Ben Johnson at the Seoul Olympics, the

Dubin Report (1990), the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport (1990), the Sport Commission (1990), and the Minister's Task Force on Federal Sport Policy (1991), have all raised questions about the high performance sport emphasis, NSO autonomy, and NSO/federal government relations. As stated in the Dubin Report (1990), "the day-to-day administration of sport in Canada has become a function of government to a degree that was never intended nor, indeed, is either healthy or appropriate for sport" (p. 529). In addition, Canada's international sport image, the breakdown of eastern block countries, and the recent ruling of the International Olympic Committee to reinstate South Africa as a member of the Olympic movement will all have major implications on the future direction of Canada's sport delivery system. As the context of the sport delivery system alters, the impact on NSOs will be visible in their strategies, structures, and systems of operation. With a long term forecast for an institutional environment that is less of a coercive force on the program development of NSOs, we may see the renewal of old design archetypes and the emergence of new ones as each NSO strives to carve out its niche in this new and uncertain "open market".

The research reported in this study is specific to a population of NSOs in a particular setting during a definite time frame. There was no attempt to claim a general theory of organizational design change. Yet its longitudinal nature together with the theoretical and empirical issues it raises, provides supportive evidence for a comprehensive understanding of organizational design change that includes an assessment of the historical context and present institutional setting (cf. Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Kimberly, 1984, 1987). Such an approach aids in identifying those structural elements that are tightly coupled to the core values of organizational members and are thus, most resistant to change. The point to be stressed is that the synthesis of concepts developed in work on organizational change in general and on NSOs in particular, goes a long way in providing a rich interpretive framework for the analysis of strategic organizational design change.

Bibliography

Bryson, J.M. (1990). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dubin, C.L. (1990). Report of the Dubin inquiry into the use of drugs and banned practices intended to increase athletic performance. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.

Fredrickson, J.W. (1986). The strategic decision process and organizational structure. Academy of Management Review, 11, 280-297.

Gersick, C.J.G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. Academy of Management Review, 16, 10-36.

Government of Canada. (1990, December). Amateur sport: Future challenges. Second report of the standing committee on Health & Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women. Sub-Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport. Ottawa: Author.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. Organization Studies, 9, 293-316.

Hickson, D.J., Butler, R.J., Cray, D., Mallory, G.R., & Wilson, D.C. (1986). Top decisions: Strategic decision making in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hinings, C.R., & Greenwood, R. (1988). The dynamics of strategic change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). The change masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performances, class, power, and the Canadian state. In P.J. Galasso (Ed.), Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kimberly, J.R. (1984). The anatomy of organizational design. Journal of Management, 10, 109-126.

Kimberly, J.R. (1987). The study of organization: Toward a biographical perspective. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 223-237). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kimberly, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. Journal of Management Studies, 24, 595-622.

Langley, A. (1990). Patterns in the use of formal analysis in strategic decisions. Organization Studies, 11, 17-45.

Laughlin, R.C. (1991). Environmental disturbances and organizational transitions and transformations: Some alternative models. Organization Studies, 12, 209-232.

Macintosh, D. (1988). The federal government and voluntary sport associations. In J. Harvey & H. Cantelon (Eds.), Not just a game (pp. 121-139). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Macintosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). The game planners: Transforming Canada's sport system. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McKinney, J.C. (1966). Constructive typology and social theory. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 340-363.

Minister's Task Force on Federal Sport Policy. (1991). A background paper. Ottawa: Ministry of State, Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Mintzberg, H. (1991). The effective organization: Forces and forms. Sloan Management Review, 32, 54-67.

Sport Commission. (1990). The background to change: Discussion paper I. A discussion paper of the Sport Commission conducted at the Sport Forum meeting, Toronto, April, 1991.

Tolbert, P.S., & Zucker, L.G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 22-39.

Tushman, M.L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and reorientation. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 7 (pp. 171-222). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Appendix 1*
Frequency Distribution of Design Archetype Attributes and Patterns of Change for National Sport Organizations, 1984-1988

National Sport Organization	1984	1986	1988	Pattern of Change
ALPINE SKI	E.O.=8	E.O.=11	E.O.=10	
	B.R.=4	B.R.=1	B.R.=2	
	K.T.=0	K.T.=0	K.T.=0	
	Approx. E.O.	Executive Office	Executive Office	Convergence
ARCHERY	E.O.=1	E.O.=1	E.O.=4	
	B.R.=5	B.R.=10	B.R.=6	
	K.T.=6	K.T.=1	K.T.=2	
	Indeter. K.T.	Boardroom	Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
BASKETBALL MEN'S	E.O.=5	E.O.=5	E.O.=5	
	B.R.=6	B.R.=7	B.R.=7	
	K.T.=1	K.T.=0	K.T.=0	
	Indeter. B.R.	Approx. B.R.	Approx. B.R.	Convergence
BASKETBALL WOMEN'S	E.O.=2	E.O.=4	E.O.=5	
	B.R.=10	B.R.=8	B.R.=7	
	K.T.=0	K.T.=0	K.T.=0	
	Boardroom	Approx. B.R.	Approx. B.R.	Reorientation
BIATHLON	E.O.=2	E.O.=2	E.O=2	
	B.R.=3	B.R.=10	B.R.=9	
	K.T.=7	K.T.=0	K.T.1	
	Approx. K.T.	Boardroom	Boardroom	Reorientation
BOBSLEIGH & LUGE	E.O.=0	E.O.=3	E.O.=5	
	B.R.=1	B.R.=7	B.R.=5	
	K.T.=11	K.T.=2	K.T.=2	
	Kitchen Table	Approx. B.R.	Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
BOXING	E.O.=1	E.O.=2	E.O.=5	
	B.R.=7	B.R.=6	B.R.=5	
	K.T.=4	K.T.=4	K.T.=2	
	Approx. B.R.	Indeter. B.R.	Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
CANOE	E.O.=2	E.O.=4	E.O.=6	
	B.R.=6	B.R.=7	B.R.=5	
	K.T.=4	K.T.=1	K.T.=1	
	Indeter. B.R.	Approx. B.R.	Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
CROSS COUNTRY SKI	E.O.=1	E.O.=4	E.O.=7	
	B.R.=7	B.R.=7	B.R.=5	
	K.T.=4	K.T.=1	K.T.=0	
	Approx. B.R.	Approx. B.R.	Approx. E.O.	Reorientation

Appendix 1 Continued

National Sport Organizations	1984	1986	1988	Pattern of Change
CYCLING	E.O.=2 B.R.=8 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=3 B.R.=7 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=4 B.R.=6 K.T.=2 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
DIVING	E.O.=1 B.R.=11 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=9 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	Reorientation
EQUESTRIAN	E.O.=4 B.R.=4 K.T.=4 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=2 B.R.=8 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=2 B.R.=8 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	Convergence
FENCING	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=3 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=9 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=8 K.T.=1 Approx. B.R.	Reversal
FIELD HOCKEY MEN'S	E.O.=3 B.R.=6 K.T.=3 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=9 K.T.=0 Boardroom	Convergence
FIELD HOCKEY WOMEN'S	E.O.=6 B.R.=5 K.T.=1 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	Convergence
FIGURE SKATING	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	Reorientation
GYMNASTICS MEN'S	E.O.=2 B.R.=6 K.T.=4 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=2 B.R.=6 K.T.=4 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=2 B.R.=8 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	Convergence
GYMNASTICS WOMEN'S	E.O.=2 B.R.=4 K.T.=6 Indeter. K.T.	E.O.=2 B.R.=8 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=6 K.T.=1 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
JUDO	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	Convergence

Appendix 1 Continued

National Sport Organization	1984	1986	1988	Pattern of Change
NORDIC COMBINED	E.O.=1 B.R.=1 K.T.=10 Kitchen Table	E.O.=1 B.R.=6 K.T.=5 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=4 K.T.=3 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
RHYTHMIC GYMNASTICS	E.O.=3 B.R.=4 K.T.=5 Indeter. K.T.	E.O.=3 B.R.=9 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=8 K.T.=1 Approx. B.R.	Reversal
ROWING	E.O.=3 B.R.=7 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
SHOOTING	E.O.=6 B.R.=4 K.T.=2 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	Convergence
SKI JUMPING	E.O.=2 B.R.=3 K.T.=7 Approx. K.T.	E.O.=2 B.R.=7 K.T.=3 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=5 K.T.=2 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
SOCCER	E.O.=9 B.R.=3 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=9 B.R.=3 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=10 B.R.=2 K.T.=0 Executive Office	Inertia
SPEED SKATING	E.O.=4 B.R.=7 K.T.=1 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	Reversal
SWIMMING	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=11 B.R.=1 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=11 B.R.=1 K.T.=0 Executive Office	Reorientation
SYNCHRONIZED SWIMMING	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=6 B.R.=6 K.T.=0 Indeter. E.O.	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	Reorientation
TABLE TENNIS	E.O.=1 B.R.=10 K.T.=1 Boardroom	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	E.O.=8 B.R.=4 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	Reorientation

Appendix 1 Continued

National Sport Organization	1984	1986	1988	Pattern of Change
TEAM HANDBALL	E.O.=0 B.R.=9 K.T.=3 Boardroom	E.O.=3 B.R.=7 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=6 B.R.=3 K.T.=3 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
TRACK & FIELD	E.O.=7 B.R.=5 K.T.=0 Approx. E.O.	E.O.=9 B.R.=3 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=9 B.R.=3 K.T.=0 Executive Office	Convergence
VOLLEYBALL	E.O.=9 B.R.=3 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=10 B.R.=2 K.T.=0 Executive Office	E.O.=10 B.R.=2 K.T.=0 Executive Office	Inertia
WATER POLO	E.O.=1 B.R.=6 K.T.=5 Indeter. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=5 B.R.=7 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	Convergence
WEIGHTLIFTING	E.O.=3 B.R.=7 K.T.=2 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=4 B.R.=7 K.T.=1 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=6 B.R.=5 K.T.=1 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
WRESTLING	E.O.=2 B.R.=7 K.T.=3 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=4 B.R.=8 K.T.=0 Approx. B.R.	E.O.=6 B.R.=5 K.T.=1 Indeter. E.O.	Unresolved
YACHTING	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=0 B.R.=12 K.T.=0 Boardroom	E.O.=2 B.R.=10 K.T.=0 Boardroom	Inertia

* E.O. = Executive Office; B.R. = Boardroom; K.T. = Kitchen Table